clear, this bill actually helps keep spouses of elderly patients from impoverishment and out of costly nursing home settings. For spouses of patients receiving home or community-based care, the bill will protect them from impractical reductions in their income or resources and ensures that they can live out their lives with independence and dignity.

Finally, we clarified the authority of State Medicaid fraud and abuse control units that investigate and prosecute abuse and neglect of Medicaid beneficiaries. This is simply good government. It is good government oversight, and it protects patients who are some of America’s most vulnerable.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friends on the Energy and Commerce Committee for their work on the bill: Dr. Burgess, Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Upton, Mr. Walberg, and their counterparts on the Democratic side, Ms. Eshoo, Mrs. Dingell, Ms. Matsui, Mr. Welch, and, of course, Chairman Pallone.

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

Mr. Guthrie. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker. In closing, I thank Chairman Pallone, Republican leader Walden, and the Energy and Commerce Committee staff for their hard work to help this bipartisan package come together.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank my colleague, Congresswoman Debbie Dingell, for working with me on extending Medicaid Follows the Person. I also thank my colleagues, Representative Matsui, Representative Eshoo, Representative Welch, and Representative Walberg, for their hard work on this package.

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

Mrs. Dingell. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to echo the words of my colleague, Mr. Guthrie, and thank all of those who helped bring this bill to the floor today. I give particular thanks to Chairman Pallone and Ranking Member Walden for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker. I urge all Members to support H.R. 3253.

As a caregiver, I have met so many people in the last few years who are desperate and scared and who need us to care. This bill does that. I hope the House today will show this country we can act bipartisanly, giving hope.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. Dingell) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3253, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. Brooks of Alabama, 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 motion will be postponed.

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 Whole House on the state of the Whole House on the state of the House Report 116-111 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Rouda) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENTS IN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. VISCOSKY OF INDIANA

Mr. Viscosky. Madam Chair, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 436, as the designee of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. Lowey), I offer amendments en bloc, which are at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 13, 2019, amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 116-111 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Rouda) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENTS IN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. VISCOSKY OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. STEWART OF UTAH

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $200,000)”.

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by $200,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Page 223, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $8,500,000)”.

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $8,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $2,000,000)”.

Page 248, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $2,000,000)”.
AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN
Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert: "(reduced by $1,700,000)."
Page 223, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $5,000,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. BERA OF CALIFORNIA
Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert: "(reduced by $20,000,000)."
Page 223, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $2,000,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OF OFFERED BY MR. MOUTHOU OF MASSACHUSETTS
Page 222, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert: "(decreased by $4,500,000)."
Page 222, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $8,300,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. MOUTHOU OF MASSACHUSETTS
Page 251, line 10, after the first dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $1,500,000)."
Page 251, line 10, after the first dollar amount, insert: "(reduced by $3,000,000)."
Page 251, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $3,000,000)."
Page 251, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert: "(reduced by $3,000,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. EMMER OF MINNESOTA
Page 223, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $3,000,000)."
Page 223, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert: "(decreased by $3,000,000)."
Page 290, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $5,000,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. KIDDER OF MICHIGAN
Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert: "(reduced by $1,000,000)."
Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $2,000,000)."
Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert: "(reduced by $3,000,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA OF CALIFORNIA
Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert: "(decreased by $2,500,000)."
Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $5,000,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL OF CALIFORNIA
Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert: "(reduced by $5,000,000)."
Page 223, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $5,000,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OF OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL OF CALIFORNIA
Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert: "(reduced by $2,500,000)."
Page 223, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $5,000,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. APPAS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert: "(reduced by $2,000,000)."
Page 223, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $2,000,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. APPAS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
Page 246, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $5,000,000)."
Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert: "(reduced by $2,500,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MS. SHERILL OF NEW JERSEY
Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert: "(reduced by $3,000,000)."
Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $3,000,000)."

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MS. TORRES OF NEW MEXICO
Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert: "(reduced by $5,000,000)."
Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert: "(increased by $5,000,000)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCOSKY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, the amendments included in the en bloc amendment, and I thank the Defense Subcommittee chairman for working with our side to include many amendments important to our Members. The chairman has been a great partner and has been very fair throughout this process.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment, and I thank the Defense Subcommittee chairman for working with our side to include many amendments important to our Members. The chairman has been a great partner and has been very fair throughout this process.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, let me thank the chair of the Defense Subcommittee and ranking member of the subcommittee as well.

I am delighted that my amendment No. 12 has been made in order and that we will have an opportunity to save and improve the lives of many women around the world.

My amendment provides flexibility for the Secretary of Defense to allocate resources needed to provide technical assistance by U.S. military women to military women in other countries combating violence as a weapon of war, terrorism, human trafficking, and narcotics trafficking to ameliorate their impact on women and girls around the globe.

Madam Chair, the most vulnerable people in vulnerable nations—states are women and girls and women and children. That is both in terms of sexual violence and domestic violence, and also in terms of the denial of access to education.

As the co-chair of the Congressional Afghanistan Caucus, I am reminded of the aftermath of the Afghan war. As we began to write the constitution, we thought we had made progress. But the Taliban, after a period of time, began to burn the schools that were designated for girls only.

This amendment allows women in the military of these respective countries that are prone to hostilities, violence, and disparate treatment of women. We must work with our women in the United States military and be able to be trained on the issues of fighting terrorism, human trafficking, and narcotics trafficking.

According to a UNICEF report, rape, torture, and human rights abuses are widespread. Terrorist and militant groups have been employed as a weapon of war affecting over 20,000 women and girls, and those numbers are going up.

My amendment will curb terrorism abroad by making available American technical and military expertise to militaries in other countries, like Nigeria, who are combating violent jihadis. Boko Haram, for instance was at the center of taking the Chibok girls, and it is important to be able to utilize these activities.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD "U.S. Special Operations Command’s HEROs Combat Human Trafficking" and "The Role of the Military in Combating Human Trafficking: A South African Perspective."

Washington.—January is National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month, and the Defense Department has teams who work year-round to combat these crimes worldwide.

The Human Exploitation Rescue Operative, or HERO, Child-Rescue Corps is a program developed by U.S. Special Operations Command, Warrior Care Program, and the National Association to Protect Children and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, said Army Col. Kimberly Moros, chief of SOCOM’s career transition initiatives.

"The HERO Child-Rescue Corps Program is designed for wounded, injured and ill transitioning service members and veterans who receive training in high-tech computer forensics and law enforcement skills to assist federal agents in the fight against online child sexual exploitation," she said. "Upon successful completion of the program, HERO interns will have the knowledge, skills and experience to apply for careers with federal, state and local police agencies and other organizations in the field of computer forensics."
Since 2013, more than 130 veterans and transitioning service members have entered the HERO Program. Of the successful graduates, 74 have been offered careers in federal law enforcement, another 31 are in internships, Moros said.


HUMAN TRAFFICKING

"Human trafficking includes using force, fraud or coercion to compel a person to provide labor, services or sex. It's a violation of basic human rights," said Linda Dixon, DOD Combating Trafficking in Persons Office Program Manager. "Combating trafficking in persons is a duty that DOD takes seriously as we do in other situations that bring harm to our nation. It is a global concern, and our goal is to educate every member of DOD on how to recognize and report human trafficking in the U.S. as well as around the world."

The three most common forms of trafficking, according to DOD's Combating Trafficking in Persons Office, are forced labor, sex trafficking, and child soldiering. Moros said the focus behind the HERO Corps is a simple one.

"When it comes to hunting those who prey on the innocent, who better than our nation's veterans and service members?" he said. "Much of today's human trafficking and child sexual exploitation is technology facilitated. Offenders use the internet and digital technologies to coordinate their activity, advertise, share information and hide evidence. HEROs receive training in counter-child exploitation as well as digital forensics and victim identification. And they are then embedded with federal law enforcement."

She said the HERO Child-Rescue Corps saves children in several ways. "As law enforcement first responders, they are at every crime scene, searching for critical clues that might provide evidence for an arrest or to find a victim," Moros said.

Back at the forensic lab, the HERO is the lead digital investigator, searching out clues that can lead to organized criminal rings, evidence of sexual assault and victim identification. And they are then embedded with federal law enforcement.

"In many cases, it has been the relentless focus and military mindset that has allowed HEROs to see the bigger picture and to be done in traditional law enforcement to find a victim," she added.

Kurtz said federal law enforcement is just beginning to track rescues. In 2016, Homeland Security Investigations identified and rescued 820 known child victims from sexual trafficking. In 2016, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) article on combating trafficking in human beings. The policy sets out various strategies for ensuring regional cooperation in combating human trafficking. It is suggested that the South African National Defence Force (SANDF) take the initiative in formulating a similar policy in order to effect better cooperation amongst nation to combat the rapidly growing problem of region of Africa, to combat human trafficking. In order to address the role of the SANDF in the fight against human trafficking, the article on combatting trafficking in human beings. Human trafficking affects not only individuals, but also countries across the world. It has been estimated by various international organisations that millions of victims are trapped in trafficking. Although both international entities and domestic jurisdictions have proposed various strategies to combat the problem of human trafficking, the combating of this criminal activity remains a challenge for all branches of law enforcement, including the different laws that are in place. The ultimate goal of legal jurisdictions in combating trafficking is to prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons, sexual exploitation and related forms. The United Nations (UN) Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially women and children, is the most significant. Following the prototype of the Trafficking Protocol, governments around the world have also committed themselves to enact national human trafficking legislation to address modern-day slavery. In Africa, where the scourge of trafficking is widespread, South Africa is one of the few nations that actively pursue the punishment of human trafficking. It is vital for South Africa as its viable and developing economy has become a magnet for illegal migrants and human traffickers to attract people from the whole continent fleeing from political and economic upheaval, armed conflict."

The Role of the Military in Combating Human Trafficking: A South African Perspective

(By Nina Mollema, University of South Africa)

ABSTRACT

Human trafficking is a complex and diverse crime affecting both individuals and countries across the world. As a significant facet of transnational organised crime and one of the most lucrative criminal enterprises globally, human trafficking was ranked as the second most profitable crime around the world in 2015, making it the fastest-growing source of revenue for organised criminal operations internationally. In 2015, South Africa implemented comprehensive legislation. Since such legislation was enacted, the South African government also ratified several international and regional human rights instruments in the fight against human trafficking. It is expected that such imposition upon the state to combat and punish the crime effectively, including the protection of the rights of victims. The focus of the study is on the role of the SANDF in combating human trafficking. This chapter aims to provide an overview of the SANDF in the fight against human trafficking. The SANDF is the leading law enforcement agency in South Africa, combating human trafficking. The SANDF has a moral obligation to prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons, sexual exploitation and related forms. The SANDF has a role to play in combating human trafficking, and its role is becoming more significant as the threat of human trafficking increases. The SANDF is equipped with the necessary resources and capabilities to combat human trafficking effectively. The SANDF has a role to play in combating human trafficking, and its role is becoming more significant as the threat of human trafficking increases. The SANDF has a moral obligation to prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons, sexual exploitation and related forms. The SANDF is equipped with the necessary resources and capabilities to combat human trafficking effectively. The SANDF has a role to play in combating human trafficking, and its role is becoming more significant as the threat of human trafficking increases.
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and children to, from and within South Africa for mainly labour and sex trafficking.

South Africa has the highest number of asylum seekers in the world. Although South Africa has a large number of refugees and asylum seekers, the jurisdiction is also home to an estimated five million illegal immigrants, including some three million Zimbabweans. In response to the dynamics of supply and demand, migration (which has always been endemic in Africa) to South Africa is aided by the porous nature of the country’s borders, as well as conv-ective monitoring of land, rail and sea transportation modes. Trafficked people are indistinguishable amongst these flows.

In other words, the multi-dimensional crime of human trafficking in the country, South Africa became a signatory to the Trafficking Protocol in 2000, and ratified the instrument in 2004. As a result, the jurisdiction became subject to international obligations in terms of which specific duties were imposed upon the state to combat and punish the crime effectively and to protect the rights of victims. The need to enact domestic anti-trafficking legislation was prioritised, and on 29 July 2013, the Prevention and Combating of Trafficking in Persons Act 7 of 2013 (Trafficking Act) was signed into law but only became operational on 9 August 2015. The Act introduces a universally acceptable but at the same time specific definition of human trafficking;

Trafficking ‘includes the delivery, recruitment, procurement, capture, removal, transport, and movement of a person, or the adoption of a child facilitated or secured through legal or illegal means, within or across the borders of the Republic, of a person trafficked or an immediate family member of the person trafficked, by means of:

(a) a threat of harm;
(b) the threat or use of force, intimidation or other forms of coercion;
(c) the abuse of vulnerability;
(d) fraud;
(e) deception or false pretences;
(f) debt bondage;
(g) abduction;
(h) kidnapping;
(i) the abuse of power;
(j) the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to influence the consent of a person having control or authority over another person; or
(k) the giving or receiving of payments, compensation, rewards, benefits or any other advantage, for the purpose of any form or manner of exploitation, sexual grooming or abuse of such person, including the commission of any sexual offence or any offence of a sexual nature in any other law against such person or performing any sexual act with such person, with the consent of or without the consent of the person having control or authority over another person.

The purpose of Jackson Lee Amendment #12, which is identical to the amendment adopted twice in the last Congress, is to provide the Secretary of Defense flexibility to allocate needed military resources to combat human trafficking, narcotics trafficking and their impact on women and girls across the globe.

Jackson Lee Amendment #12 helps provide the Department of Defense with the resources needed to provide technical assistance to countries on innovative strategies to provide defense technology and resources that promote the security of the American people and allied nations.

Terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking and their impact on women and girls across the globe has had a great adverse impact on us all.

Madam Chair, the United States is combating terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking and their impact on women and girls across the globe.

Terrorists across the globe have wreaked havoc on our society and cannot be tolerated or ignored, for their actions pose a threat to our national security and the security of the world.

Madam Chair, from the United States to Africa to Europe to Asia and the Middle East, it is clear that combating terrorism remains one of highest national priorities.

Collectively, helping our neighbors and their military build capacity to combat terrorism, eradicate human trafficking, stop narcotics trafficking and negate their impact on women and girls across the globe serves our national interest.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support Jackson Lee Amendment #12.
funding that could be used to reimburse the Taliban for transportation and other expenses. That is quite simply absurd.

For many years, I have worked in a bipartisan way to shine a light on how American dollars are being misspent in Afghanistan. There have been a number of oversight reports conducted by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction that highlight how these programs have been mismanaged and poorly run for years.

The SIGAR has identified a disturbing amount of waste, fraud, and abuse totaling in the billions of dollars. This level of wasteful spending is staggering, yet we continued pouring money down the drain anyway. But sending taxpayer dollars straight to the Taliban, despite the price paid by men and women in uniform, is the ultimate insult.

We owe it to the taxpayers to not waste any more of their money.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which would increase the funding level to Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) from the Department of Defense by four million dollars above current levels. I want to thank Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman Visclosky for his support of this program and of this amendment.

Since 1837, HBCUs have served as training grounds for generations of African American students and scholars, and more recently, these important institutions have strengthened America’s scientific workforce. Educating students and communities as anchors of academic excellence, HBCUs have a storied past and a dynamic present in their unique role of raising our academic leaders against the grain of decades of discrimination and racism.

Building on this long history of achievement through investment, my amendment will increase resources for HBCUs by strengthening the Department of Defense’s investments in the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering programs at HBCUs and their corresponding national security benefits.

HBCUs support some of the most cutting-edge defense and national security-related research in the country. Armed with these continuing funds, HBCUs will be able to maintain their unique role in buttressing important national security initiatives.

For example, these programs support research in mobile computers that can be deployed to aid our servicemen and servicewomen on the battlefield.

Additionally, these programs are helping to improve the way our intelligence community classifies and manages large infrared photographs taken on important reconnaissance missions.

At a time when we are encouraging more training for students in the STEM fields, and promoting the benefits of a more diverse workforce in research and in the high-tech sectors, increasing DoD’s investments for Historically Black Colleges and Universities strengthens these goals and institutions, as well as our national security. I am encouraged that this amendment was included in the package of bipartisan en bloc amendments. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I am in support of my amendment to increase funding for the Air National Guard’s Facility Modernization and Sustainment account. I appreciate the support of the chairman for its inclusion in en bloc No. 2 to the Defense Appropriations bill. I am proud of the work of the men and women in the National Guard, including in my home state of Wisconsin.

Unfortunately, decrepit, outdated, and decaying Air National Guard facilities are a disservice to the men and women who put on the uniform.

They deserve facilities that are up-to-date and which will help improve their ability to carry out their missions in defense of our nation and their communities.

Yet, we know that such aging and inefficient facilities exist nationwide including in my district. The fact that the 185th Air Refueling Wing is operating out of a building which was built in 1970, has aging and hard to maintain critical building systems and where much of the current square footage is unusable. That’s according to the Defense Department. This is simply not acceptable. That’s why I think an increase here is necessary.

I appreciate the chairman, in his mark, for boosting funding for this critical account. I applaud his recognition of the situation facing many Air Guard units across the country and his commitment to putting funding into this account.

But the needs simply continue to outpace available resources.

I am aware that there are National Guard units across our country that have worthwhile projects directly related to military readiness that they would like to pursue. This additional funding should be prioritized for projects that can help increase mission readiness at minimal additional costs to the taxpayers.

For example, projects that would give help Air Guard units to take advantage of and utilize available local assets such as national jet fuel pipelines to provide instant access to additional fuel reserves and provide a critical second, reliable, secure and convenient fuel delivery method that would help ensure that strategic missions such as refueling could continue uninterrupted should the primary method of receiving fuel be disrupted.

Now that the House has approved my amendment, I urge the Defense Department to utilize these additional funds for needed projects of high priority. This will increase readiness and contribute to our national defense.

The reality is that there are plenty out there.

Again, I support the Chairman’s mark and I am grateful for the inclusion of my amendment to help enable more projects that can build greater resiliency for execution of critical State and Federal Air National Guard missions.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chair, Lyme disease is the most prevalent vector-borne disease in the United States today, and members of the U.S. Armed Forces are not immune to its debilitating effects, as they train and complete exercises out in grassy and wooded areas.

According to the February 2018 Medical Surveillance Monthly Report, published by the Armed Forces Health Surveillance Branch, tick-borne diseases accounted for more than half of the confirmed cases of vector-borne diseases among service members—active duty and reserve—recorded over seven years, from 2010–2016. Lyme disease alone had the largest number of confirmed cases.

In the 2017 National Defense Authorization Act, the federal Tick-Borne Disease Working Group stated that “Tick-Borne Diseases have rapidly become a serious and growing threat to public health in the United States. Despite many scientific unknowns, experts agree that the incidence and distribution of tick-borne diseases are increasing.” The Working Group also stated that “Federal funding for tick-borne diseases is less per new surveillance case than that of any other disease.”

While the tick-borne disease research at CDMRP has been continuously funded at $5 million since Fiscal Year 2016, the Working Group’s report is a sign that there is still much more to be done.

The amendment I offer today will increase funding by $2 million for the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs (CDMRP) for the purposes of tick-borne disease research. The added funding will enable the CDMRP to support more innovative research to address gaps in knowledge and information on tick-borne diseases. Military and civilian personnel and their dependents who are at risk will be better informed and prepared with enhanced awareness, education, and research programs.

I urge support for this amendment—we cannot shortchange our federal responsibility. We owe it to the countless patients, including our men and women in uniform suffering from tick-borne diseases and their families.

Ms. SHERRELL. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment, and to thank the Defense Subcommittee Chairman, Mr. Visclosky, for including the Sherrill Amendment S8 in the en bloc package.

My amendment reduces the Surface and Shallow Water Mine Countermeasures program by $5 million in order to add $5 million for the Navy to advance the qualification and certification of Advanced Manufacturing processes for the integration of 3-D printed components into undersea warfare platforms. This amendment furthers the Navy’s goal of embracing cutting-edge technologies.

3-D printing reduces the cost of manufacturing parts for which there is limited supply. It also creates unique parts that would otherwise be prohibitively expensive to make with traditional manufacturing.

I am very proud of the work Marotta Controls in Montville, New Jersey, is doing to support the Navy’s mission to modernize its fleet and maintain a strong industrial base, now in its third generation of ownership. President and CEO Patrick Marotta is proudly carrying on the work his grandfather began when he founded the company during WWII. I thank Marotta Controls for their work to ensure efficiency and quality control to enable our Navy’s submarines to continue to play their critical role in defense of our nation.

I thank Defense Subcommittee Chairman Visclosky and Ranking Member Calvert for their leadership in adopting this important provision.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Visclosky).
The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting Chair. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam 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 246, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)".

Page 246, line 19, before the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $10,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I would like to begin by thanking the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order, as well as Chairman VISCLOSKY and Ranking Member CALVERT for their hard work in this division of the appropriations package.

Madam Chair, I offer this bipartisan amendment with my good friends and colleagues, Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. LIEU, in support of electromagnetic railgun, a technology that has been described as "revolutionary" and a potential multi-mission "game changer."

The electromagnetic railgun truly transforms naval power projection. This technology can rapidly launch high-velocity projectiles capable of precision strikes at a range of more than 100 miles, all without the need for combustible propellants or motors. Ships deploying with this system will have longer ranges, deeper magazines, and lower cost-per-shot than conventional naval artillery.

This technology has already received initial investments; however, current and future investment is absolutely vital to ensure the railgun module being developed is built to meet the needs of the Future Surface Combatant specifications and can be tested aboard existing naval vessels.

The additional $10 million provided by this amendment will help keep delivery of an integrated prototype mount system on its original timeline of being ready by 2021. Continued investment in this program will also support live-fire engagement testing using hypervelocity projectiles and the next generation of shipboard compatible pulsed power.

While I believe the United States continues to lead the way, our adversaries are not resting on their laurels, as they are also investing, researching, and developing these groundbreaking technologies. Earlier this year, for instance, reports emerged of the Chinese Navy fielding an electromagnetic railgun. So it is absolutely critical that we not allow them or anyone to beat us to the punch.

Given the maturity of the technology and the urgency impressed upon us by our competitors, I hope the House will send a well-funded railgun program to the Senate.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's persistence to provide robust funding for the Navy's electromagnetic railgun and recognize that he has offered a similar amendment on the fiscal year 2019 appropriations bill.

I would point out to my colleagues that the bill currently fully funds the budget request of the administration at $15 million for the railgun program.

While I do not think the additional $10 million investment will accelerate the development of a demonstrator mount and continued testing, I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, first of all, I want to thank Chairman VISCLOSKY and Ranking Member CALVERT for their comments and their support and for their hard work on the consideration of this division of the appropriations package and all they have done and continue to do to advance our national security and make sure that our warfighters never enter a fair fight.

This bipartisan amendment supports game-changing technology that is already demonstrating tactically relevant capability. Just last month at White Sands Missile Range, the Navy fired a railgun on a 34-degree trajectory at 6 megajoules and will be firing at 20 megajoules this summer.

By building upon years of development and investment, the Navy railgun will be tested as early as next year aboard surface vessels, firing explosive and nonexplosive projectiles at air- and sea-based targets.

Along with my colleagues Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. LIEU, I urge support of this amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam 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 Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam 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 245, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $2,000,000)".

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $2,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the gentleman's amendment with my good friends and colleagues, Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. LIEU, I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, my amendment would provide $2 million for civics education grants under the Department of Defense National Defense Education Program as authorized by the House fiscal year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act that was part of the Armed Services Committee last week.

Madam Chair, it is not an exaggeration to say American democracy is under attack, and we need to shore up our defenses. Foreign governments, particularly Russia, are actively engaged in efforts to undermine our democracy and sow seeds of discord among the electorate, and they have been frighteningly successful.

In the special counsel's report on Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential election, Director Mueller described Russia's election-meddling operations as "sweeping and systemic." Russia systematically waged a misinformation campaign to weaken our confidence and participation in the democratic process, including by discouraging voting, undermining confidence in our institutions of government, promoting false political narratives, and widening social divisions.

Madam Chair, we need to increase our resilience to these attacks on our democracy, and I believe civics education must be a major part of this strategy. Civics programs provide students with an understanding of American law, how government works, and the skills to participate in democracy.
A citizenry armed with a civics background, I believe, is absolutely crucial to a healthy democracy; and in the context of the threats that we face today, I believe it is vital to the stability of our democracy. Unfortunately, only 17 percent of American adults say they trust the Federal Government to do what is right at least most of the time; only 26 percent of Americans can name all three branches of government; and less than 30 percent of fourth, eighth, and twelfth graders scored proficient on the 2014 National Assessment of Education Progress civics test.

Furthermore, in 2016, only 56 percent of the United States voting-age population voted in the Presidential election, a number lower than most other developed democratic nations.

It should come as no surprise that we are vulnerable to misinformation campaigns. Too many of us do not fully understand or engage in the democratic process.

Madam Chair, I believe that we need to increase participation and improve civic knowledge, and education is, I believe, the way to do it.

$2 million for civics education is just a start, and it will fund the development of innovative, evidence-based civics programs at the Department of Defense schools to start with.

Working with colleges and universities or expert nonprofits, DOD schools will help pilot new curricula targeted to improving longitudinal metrics, including democratic participation and media literacy. This will allow us to build new programs, test their efficacy, and, from there, chart a broader path forward.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and encourage the development of more effective civics education programs.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I simply want to take the time to thank my colleagues for the work he is doing to advocate and advance knowledge of our children's rights and duties of citizenship. Again, I thank him for his work.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers, and I will close by just thanking Chairman VISCLOSKY and Ranking Member CALVERT for their work on the Defense Subcommittee portion of this package and for their commitment to our national defense.

As I said, I am troubled by the work of our enemies and adversaries to try to undermine confidence in government, sowing divisions among the electorate. I am hoping that by strengthening our civics education, starting with our young people, we will build resilience into protecting our democracy and everything that we love about this country.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam 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 Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam 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 247, line 17, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $10,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of my my amendment to provide an additional $10 million for the National Security Innovation Network, or NSIN, which was originally called MD5.

Section 225 of the 2018 NDAA authorized the national security innovation and entrepreneurial education programs, including what is now known as NSIN. NSIN aims to educate and build a network of innovators and entrepreneurs equipped with the expertise, know-how, and resources required to develop, commercialize, and apply technology for defense and national security applications.

NSIN initiatives provide education and technology innovation and entrepreneurial programs, of note, they provided a unique pathway for veterans to leverage their expertise, while learning cutting-edge business innovation methodology, and apply their knowledge to new national security problems.

Through these initiatives, DOD is growing a new generation of entrepreneurs that are adept at critical thinking, innovative problem solving, and the creation of successful ventures that deliver economic national security and social value.

One initiative in the National Security Innovation Network is the highly successful Hacking for Defense course. Hacking for Defense, or H4D, is a course currently taught at more than twenty-dozen universities in the Nation. It pairs student teams with sponsors from across the defense and intelligence community to apply lean start-up methodology developed in Silicon Valley to rapidly solve challenging, unclassified national security problems.

H4D was authorized in the 2018 National Defense Authorization Act and has been taught, for 3 years, already producing innovative solutions to national security problems. For example, a team at Columbia University helped Special Operations Command automate communication of essential information from the battlefield to Central Command; a Stanford team helped develop an innovative way for Navy SEALs to spend less time underwater.

These and other successful innovations have been developed by students in these classes. The innovation and entrepreneurial education that occurs with H4D also helps to train the next generation of our industrial-based innovators. In this way, it provides tremendous benefit to our national security.

Madam Chair, I have had discussions with Chairman VISCLOSKY on this amendment about the best way to move forward with this funding increase, and I believe we have come to an agreement on the best way to move forward to get an even bigger increase.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), chairman of the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I certainly do support his amendment.

The amendment expands the Hacking for Defense program, designed to provide students the opportunity to learn how to work with the Department and intelligence community to better address the Nation’s emerging threats. It is an important activity, and he is absolutely correct.

Madam Chair, I would point out for my colleagues that, in the current fiscal year, this program was funded at $7 million. In the Appropriations Committee, I appreciate his advocacy on behalf of this program—that has now been increased to $40 million. Money is not everything, but it is important to this program to make sure it is adequately funded.

I, again, thank the gentleman very much for his work.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman VISCLOSKY for his work on this appropriations bill and for working with me on this amendment. I appreciate his advocacy on behalf of this program and the importance of the work that we do.
maintaining our security. A small increase in investment in Hacking for Defense helps us do this, while also training the next generation of innovators who understand the need to contribute to our national security.

Madam Chair, with the agreement of the chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), 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 C (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 2. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Directive-type Memorandum (DTM)-19-004, Military Service by Transgender Persons and Persons with Gender Dysphoria, March 12, 2019 (effective date April 12, 2019).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise to offer this amendment on behalf of Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER from California, who has been a determined leader and partner in pushing back on this administration’s ban on transgender servicemembers.

Madam Chair, this amendment is very simple. It states that no money appropriated in this Defense appropriation bill will be used to implement the President’s ban on transgender servicemembers. No money shall be used to ask whether or not a servicemember has transitioned; to force them to remain closeted in a Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell environment; to force them out to the Main Closeted in a Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell environment; or to force them out of the service.

The President and his administration wrongfully argue that it is about military readiness and unit cohesion, but these arguments are the same ones that were made to keep the military racially segregated.

Madam Chair, my service in an integrated armed service did not harm readiness, and neither does the service of the more than 14,000 transgender soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

Transgender servicemembers increase lethality and readiness. They have served honorably and have received prestige commendations. They are proof that anyone who can serve should be afforded the opportunity to serve. This legacy of honorable service will outlast this administration, this transgender ban, and this administration’s attack on transgender Americans. This is our country’s enumerated right; it’s our country’s enumerated right to determine our own, individual, rights.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to do what is right: Put country before party; defend the thousands of Americans who are making the greatest sacrifice they can make for our country. Defend the brave and patriotic service members who urge Congress to talk about their service and the service of other transgender service members. Defend them unquestionably. Defend the thousands of transgender servicemembers impacted. Defend them as they have defended us.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, this amendment risks undermining the readiness of our military at a time when our nation and Allied forces are experiencing massive heightening of the threat. It does so by prohibiting the implementation of a careful and thoughtful policy developed by a panel of military experts last year regarding military service by transgender individuals.

Then-Secretary of Defense Mattis wrote that, in his best professional judgment, allowing military service by transgender individuals in the absence of this policy could ‘‘undermine the readiness, disrupt the unit cohesion, and impose an unreasonable burden on the military that is not conductive to military effectiveness and lethality.’’

This current policy is not—I repeat, not—a ban on service by transgender individuals. It carefully balances the readiness needs of the military with the medical needs of transgender individuals who wish to serve.

As new recruits, those individuals can serve openly under their biological sex so long as they have not suffered from gender dysphoria within 36 months and have not undergone gender transition procedures.

Furthermore, the new policy only applies to those seeking to join the military after its April 12, 2019, implementation and allows the service and the Commandant of the Marine Corps to waive its application in individual cases.

This issue is not one of social policy but of deployability. Individuals with medical conditions that do not allow them to deploy, such as those identified in the policy, adversely impact military readiness and reduce the military’s warfighting capability.

I would also point out that individuals who require daily injections for other medical conditions are also not deployable, such as people who have diabetes.

Madam Chair, the military is an institution with one primary mission: to fight and win our Nation’s wars. Anything that interferes with its readiness for that mission poses an unacceptable risk to our men and women in uniform.

Unfortunately, this amendment poses just such a risk by disregarding the President’s enumerated right and interfering with the policy developed to preserve warfighting readiness.

Madam Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to do so as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, no one would argue that military readiness and deployability are paramount, but transgender service members do not inherently impact either.

Every service chief testified that transgender service would not disrupt unit cohesion or readiness and emphasized soldier deployability and not their gender identity.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), chairman of the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I would point out that the chiefs of the Army, Navy, Air Force and the Commandant of the Marine Corps testified that the inclusive policy adopted under the Obama administration has caused no readiness issues. A panel of retired military Surgeons General released a report finding the ban’s rationale for inclusion is contradicted by ample evidence and that the ban ‘‘harms readiness through forced dishonesty, wasted talent, double standards, and barriers to adequate care.’’

Madam Chair, this is the right thing to do, and I would simply close by saying, with so much anger and so much hate in this world today, it is time to be kind to people.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague and also Congresswoman ESCOBAR for their leadership on this critical issue.

Madam Chair, I am so disappointed that in 2019 this amendment is even necessary. Our military is strong and capable because of our dedicated servicemembers, including nearly 15,000 transgender troops.

This year, the Armed Services Committee held a hearing on the President’s policy, and Active-Duty transgender servicemembers testified before the House for the first time. Each one was an incredibly capable, experienced, and decorated leader.

The DOD’s exhaustive review found no valid reason to ban these patriotic
Americans who meet the same criteria as their peers.

For 3 years, our military has operated under a de facto inclusive policy where thousands could serve openly, to quote General Millie, “precisely zero unit cohesion problems.”

Eighteen militaries already have inclusive policies without incidents or impact to readiness, and the facts reveal this policy for what it is: discrimination.

I urge my colleagues to support Ms. Spreier’s amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam 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 Maryland will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Mr. AMASH. Madam 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 C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 1. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to submit a certification under section 702(h) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, or for an acquisition pursuant to such a certification, if such certification does not include the following sentence: "This certification does not authorize any acquisition that intentionally targets a person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States and does not have a significant purpose of such targeting is to acquire the communications of a particular, known person reasonably believed to be in the United States, any acquisition of a communication as to which no participant is a person who is targeted pursuant to the authorized acquisition, or any acquisition of a communication known to be entirely domestic.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For more than a year, Republicans have been speaking forcefully about the need of FISA to gather intelligence on people associated with the Trump campaign. The concern is that some information was inappropriately included in an application submitted to the FISA court which then found probable cause and granted an order to authorize surveillance of a Trump associate.

I appreciate my colleague’s concerns about Americans’ Fourth Amendment rights, but if my colleagues are concerned about the use of FISA used during the 2016 Presidential campaign, they should be terrified of section 702.

Under section 702 of FISA, the FISA court does not approve targets. There are no individualized applications or rigorous due process required in order to collect communications. The government can search and sweep in billions of communications, including communications of Americans, and then query that data for a particular American’s communications without a warrant.

The communications can be used to investigate and prosecute Americans. The government can use an American’s data to send them to prison without ever obtaining a warrant for it.

The Amash-Lofgren amendment puts basic safeguards to allow the government to continue using section 702 for its stated purpose of gathering foreign intelligence, while limiting the government’s warrantless collection of Americans’ communications under FISA.

This amendment gives my Republican colleagues an opportunity to show that their concern about Fourth Amendment violations extends to the countless Americans that are impacted by the government’s warrantless FISA surveillance.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, the proposed change inserts a new test for the certification of acquisition and is likely meant to make it more difficult for the NSA to target foreign nationals if the intended target is in communication with someone in the United States.

I would point out, however, to the gentleman that this is an appropriations bill. This is not an authorization bill. The amendment is a serious change in policy and deserves more than 10 minutes of debate in this Chamber on our bill.

The issue belongs in the authorizing committees. I do not believe that this amendment has benefited from the work of the authorization process, and I do believe it would potentially put American lives at greater risk.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chairwoman, a vote for this amendment is also a vote to keep the President in check. For 2 years now my Democratic colleagues have spoken about the administration’s violation of civil liberties and its disregard for laws passed by Congress.

Section 702 is a broad authority with limited oversight and its regular use involves the warrantless collection of Americans’ data. Even under previous administrations, the government has misled or kept information from Congress about its use of surveillance authorities, including their impact on Americans.

The government has also repeatedly failed to abide by legal limitations placed on those surveillance powers. The Fourth Amendment recognizes that broad surveillance powers are too dangerous to be put in the hands of any President.

The Amash-Lofgren amendment protects Fourth Amendment secured rights by limiting the ability of the President to unconstitutionally collect Americans’ communications without a warrant.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. For over 3 years, the House Intelligence Committee posted brutal classified material on our website and conducted public education sessions for Members to learn about FISA section 702.

FISA section 702 is a critical national security authority that has helped the United States collect vital intelligence on terrorists and other hostile actors located overseas. After vigorous debate, we were able to pass a bipartisan, bicameral compromise bill in the last Congress that preserved the operational flexibility of section 702 while instituting reforms to further protect U.S. persons’ privacy.

President Trump signed this legislation into law in January of 2018. The amendment today seeks to reopen a debate that was settled last Congress. Rather than debating this issue within the relevant committees of jurisdiction, however, Members who lost the debate last year now seek to have another bite at that apple to subvert the legislative process by submerging these reforms.

If passed, I fear this amendment will have devastating consequences on our national security.

First, the amendment creates new, strict requirements on targeting of foreign actors overseas just because the hostile foreign actor is communicating with an associate in the United States. If this amendment were to pass, if a terrorist located in a foreign country communicates with a U.S. person located in the United States, the intelligence community might not be able to use section 702 to target that terrorist because he is communicating with a person in the United States.

For example, the courier risk community was able to thwart Najibullah Zazi’s planned terrorist attack to detonate explosives in Manhattan. If this amendment were enacted, the FBI and NSA might not have been able to use 702 to target the al-Qaeda courier in Pakistan communicating back to conspirators in the United States, thus resulting in another terrorist attack in New York City.
Section 702 was enacted to prevent this type of event. This example illustrates the amendment’s callous disregard for the history of the program. Second, the amendment would limit NSA’s about communications collection. NSA’s communications collection takes place in NSA’s upstream collection, and due to how internet communications works, allows NSA to collect the communications that may reference a 702 target’s email address. Again, we debated this issue last Congress and placed a statutory restriction on NSA’s ability to continue about collection until meeting certain requirements. I strongly urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chairwoman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chairwoman, my colleague is parroting the same things we hear each time we try to make any reforms to the government surveillance authorities. These arguments are no longer credible.

Just a few months ago, the former Director of National Intelligence admitted that the government “may have oversold” the importance of the NSA’s dragnet of Americans’ phone records when Congress was considering reforms in 2013. Now we have seen reports that the program has been shuttered entirely despite the government’s dire warnings about limiting it to protect Americans’ rights.

Madam Chair, my amendment still allows the government to use section 702 for its purpose of surveilling for-

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, and I want to rise to offer my support for his tireless efforts on this topic, in particular. It should not be a hard question that the American citizens, the people who live here afforded protections under our Constitution, should not be targeted unnecessarily, even when we are doing our appropriate job to target those who wish to do us harm abroad. I believe that the amendment in question attempts to do just that, to ensure we have those tools to target those abroad while protecting American citizens, and I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from California for sponsoring this amendment. This is needed.

Mr. SCHUMER. When the leader in this Congress, in the Senate was on the Rachel Maddow Show on January 3 talking about what took place with the President of the United States, and he said this: “We would all do well to remember, if it can happen—talking about the FISA issue—if it can happen, I imagine what they can do to you and I. Imagine what they can do to you and I. We need reform in this program.”

Second, CHUCK SCHUMER. When the leader in this Congress, in the Senate was on the Rachel Maddow Show on January 3 talking about what took place with the President. The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Chair, Mr. SCHUMER said this, about the President. He said: “Let me tell you: You take on the community, they have six ways from Sunday at getting back at you.”

That is not how it is supposed to work in this country. That is not how it is supposed to work. The unelected people answer to the elected individual. This is about reforming this program, making sure it respects our fundamental liberties. I respect the gentleman for bringing the amendment forward.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chairwoman, when I go back to my district, I hear from my constituents and they always ask: What is wrong with Washington? We can see what is wrong with Washington right here. We have Republicans for months saying: We are worried about FISA abuse. FISA is out of control.

Here we are trying to limit FISA, and they are running against it. They are saying: No, we can’t limit FISA. Democrats say: We want to hold the President in check. Executive powers are out of control.

We have an amendment to hold the President in check. This is our time to stand up for the American people. I am sick of going home and telling them that we wanted to defend their rights. I want to thank Ms. LOPCHEN for joining me in this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield the remaining time of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, may I ask the Chair how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairwoman, section 702 authorizes the intelligence community to target the communications of non-U.S. persons located outside the United States for foreign intelligence purposes.

This FISA section 702 program is an important tool for the intelligence community to gather foreign intelligence information to protect the homeland against international terrorism, weapons proliferation, hostile actions, cyber actors, and other threats to the national security.

Importantly, its focus is on foreigners located abroad. It does not allow the intelligence community to target U.S. persons. Section 702 collections already include significant protection for civil liberties and privacy.

While the amendment may be well-intentioned, I fear it will upset the delicate balance reflected in current wording of this provision. The recent comprehensive review and bipartisan reauthorization of section 702 by Congress would strongly suggest that additional changes to the program without a full review of the potential impact is ill-advised.

Madam Chairwoman, intelligence officials from the Obama administration and the Trump administration have asserted, as FBI Director Christopher Wray recently reiterated, that section 702 is one of the most viable tools we have in our toolbox to keep America safe. Accordingly, I oppose this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I am opposed to the amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.
stands that amendment No. 25 will not be postponed. The gentleman from Michigan will be recognized in part A of House Report 116–111.

Moreover, as written the amendment strongly suggests that the IC immediately would have to stop collecting the communications of a suspected terrorist abroad, simply because the suspected terrorist was communicating with an individual thought to be within the United States. The IC should not be required to cease collection of intelligence in situations where it is entirely appropriate to collect it, and where it is clear that such collection can be conducted in a manner that fully safeguards privacy rights. The IC should not be banned from collecting intelligence in a fashion that protects privacy, if it can devise an appropriate means of doing so. And yet that is precisely what the amendment would take off the table, in advance.

I see no reason to disturb the balance that we struck in 2018, after such extensive and rigorous deliberation. And I see many, strong reasons to leave in place this critically necessary intelligence gathering tool, on which our important foreign policy decisions rely every day.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam 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 Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Chair, I will offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Chair, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.
BRAD SCHNEIDER, emphasizes the importance of the DOD funding research to increase the capacity of the defense industry to produce lead-free electronics that meet the performance requirements of our Nation’s Armed Forces. This research will ensure that American companies can supply the men and women who keep us safe with modern, resilient technology that meets their unique needs.

I look forward to working with the DOD and the House Appropriations Subcommittee to ensure funding for the development of this program.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Visclosky).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding me time and simply would suggest that the committee has no opposition to the amendment.

I would point out that, again, she struck a chord with me when she talked about the supply chain problems we have in the United States of America across the industrial sector.

Again, I appreciate her raising this and offering the amendment. Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Ms. Kuster), the amendment No. 36 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in part A of House Report 116–111. Mr. Visclosky, Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Texas, 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 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $9,000,000)”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Chair, my amendment inadvertently contains a numerical drafting error that would increase spending. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified with the form that I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

The amendment is modified to read as follows:

Page 224, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I am pleased to offer my amendment that addresses an important supply chain issue related to defense electronics.

Driven by environmental regulations outside the United States, the worldwide $1 trillion commercial electronics industry converted to lead-free components over 15 years ago. Despite this global transition, the United States aerospace and defense electronics industry continues to rely upon lead-based assembly technology because lead-based assembly is considered structurally superior.

To ensure the reliability and performance of lead-free technology for defense and aerospace electronics, additional research and development are needed. Because the DOD electronics market is just a small fraction of the broader electronics market, commercial industry needs Federal leadership in this area.

As technological advances in civilian electronics continue to incorporate lead-free technology, this problem will only become more acute. As a result, the DOD cannot rapidly integrate state-of-the-art lead-free components, including semiconductors, for cutting-edge technologies like hypersonics, artificial intelligence, and robotics that impact numerous DOD weapons systems.

This disconnect between the defense and commercial electronics industries can no longer be ignored.

My amendment, which I am offering with my colleague Representative...
It found that rising global temperatures, changing precipitation patterns, climbing sea levels, and more extreme weather events will intensify the challenges of global instability, hunger, poverty, and conflict.

It will likely lead to food and water shortages, pandemic disease, disputes over refugees and resources, and destruction by natural disasters in regions across the globe.

Earlier this year, the department released another report that found that more than two-thirds of the military’s operationally critical installations are threatened by climate change.

It noted that the effects of a changing climate are a national security issue with potential impacts to the Department of Defense’s missions, operational plans, and installations.

As an example, the Air Force currently oversees 15 radar sites in Alaska. Since the Cold War, they have monitored much of the Bering Sea and the Arctic. When the radar sites were selected in the 1950s, along Alaska’s coastlines and deep in its interior, melting permafrost and coastal erosion were not yet long-term strategic concerns for the department.

However, the melting of permafrost is happening more rapidly than Pentagon officials predicted, and it is causing the ground beneath the sites to crumble. Three radar sites in Alaska were forced to close in 2007 due in part to soil erosion.

A 2014 Government Accountability Office report found that the installations are seeing erosion that the Pentagon did not expect to occur until 2050.

This amendment ensures that the Department of Defense continues to provide scientifically based information about the effects of climate change on national security.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, just 5 months ago, the Department of Defense completed a public assessment titled “Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense.”

The report accompanying the bill includes further directive language regarding additional reporting requirements for the department.

How many reports do we need on this topic in 1 year? This amendment is extraneous and unnecessary; I urge my colleagues to oppose it; and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I would simply state that the department must be transparent in reporting the strategic, operational, and financial costs of climate change.

I would ask support for 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 Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

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

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MISS GONZA´LEZ-COLO´N

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in part A of House Report 116-111, MISS GONZA´LEZ-COLO´N of Puerto Rico, Madam 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 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $4,356,000) (reduced by $4,356,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZA´LEZ-COLO´N) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico, Miss GONZA´LEZ-COLO´N of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, today I rise to speak on behalf of the bipartisan amendment No. 41 to division C of the Defense appropriations division to H.R. 2740.

My amendment seeks to provide an increase of $4,356,000 to further support the Department of Defense’s Innovative Readiness Training program, bringing its total recommended funding level for fiscal year 2020 to $30 million. This proposed increase is made possible by reducing the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide account by the same amount.

The Innovative Readiness Training program, IRT program, is a Department of Defense military training opportunity, exclusive to the United States territories, that delivers multi-year mission to build a special-needs camp.

Participating units, therefore, increased their readiness and obtained valuable, hands-on training experience that provides造福 thousands of their fellow American citizens in Puerto Rico receive the care they need.

Other communities across the Nation have also benefited greatly from this program. In Alaska, as an example, the program supports missions like Operation Arctic Care, which provided roving medical and dental care to rural Alaska Native villages.

In the Northern Mariana Islands—and I want to thank Congressman Sablan for being an original cosponsor of this amendment—these missions have helped renovate and improve the Tinian Health Clinic.

In Mississippi, this mission has partnered with a local foundation in a multi-year mission to build a special-needs camp.

Given how these missions have been vital in improving our servicemembers’ readiness while simultaneously offering quality services to thousands of Americans, I strongly believe Congress should provide as much support as possible for the program. This amendment seeks to do that.

I commend Chairman VISCLOSKY, Ranking Member CALVERT, and the House Appropriations Committee for including a $10 million increase above the President’s budget request, and my amendment simply seeks to complete this effort by providing an additional increase to bring the program total budget to $30 million, consistent with the recommended funding level in the Senate version for the fiscal year 2020.

Madam Chair, I want to conclude by thanking my colleague Congressman

...
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in part A of House Report 116-111. Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I rise today because 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 238, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $7,500,000) (increased by $7,500,000)”.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This amendment would establish a pilot program that would allow an expeditionary sea base, ESB, to be equipped with weaponry to defend itself.

This pilot program is needed because, currently, an ESB must be accompanied by a destroyer when on a mission. To deploy a destroyer, operational costs add up to $33 million.

If the $7.5 million pilot program—which is the cost—is passed, then this expeditionary sea base will be able to protect itself and a destroyer will no longer be required to accompany it, allowing the destroyer to complete other missions.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for this amendment. They make that fine ship in San Diego, California, and we want to defend it to the hilt, so we appreciate this amendment.

It makes the bill a better bill, and I thank the gentleman for bringing that bill forward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in part A of House Report 116-111. Mr. TED LIEU of California, Madam 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 C (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 1. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue export licenses for the following defense items, including defense articles, defense services, and related technical data, described in the certification Transmittal Numbers DDTC-17-079, DDTC-17-094, DDTC-17-112, DDTC-17-126, DDTC-17-128, DDTC-18-013, DDTC-18-029, DDTC-18-030, DDTC-18-050, DDTC-18-077, DDTC-18-087, DDTC-19-001, 17-0B, 17-0M, 17-0R, 17-CU, 18-AU, 18-BE, 19-AA and 19-AR.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. TED LIEU of California, Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On May 24, the Trump administration notified Congress that it was declaring a so-called emergency to bypass congressional review of 22 arms sales to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. I am offering this amendment because there is no emergency, just a conflict in Yemen that has killed thousands of civilians with U.S.-made weapons and a Congress that is tired of being complicient.

That is why we voted last month to pass bipartisan, bicameral resolutions to end U.S. support for the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen.

Despite that clear signal from Congress, the administration decided to use an emergency power to go around us and push through an unpopular arms package that would likely be used in that conflict.

That package includes an unprecedented proposal to massively scale production of precision-guided munitions to Saudi Arabia, essentially outsourcing jobs to the kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Simply put, this is an egregious abuse of the emergency authority we gave the executive and a direct affront to our nation's interests.

To add insult to injury, the arms in question aren't even available to be exported. As Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs Clarke Cooper testified last week, most of these weapons systems will not be ready for months, if not potentially years.

Our arm sales process was designed to include congressional review specifically to ensure that each case serves U.S. interests. If the administration believes that these sales can stand on the merits, they should make their case to Congress. Until they do, we must use the power of the purse and every other avenue to block them.

I also want to thank Chairman Visconti for his leadership and support as well. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, at the outset, it should be clear: There is no country that is more hostile to the interests of the United States and our allies, especially Israel, than Iran.

In fact, as we debate this bill, the U.S. and our partners in the region are facing a serious threat from Iran and its proxies.

As our commander of the U.S. Central Command, General Frank McKenzie, said recently, the Iranian threat remains imminent.

Just last week, Iran’s Revolutionary Guard forces used a type of precision-guided mine—a limpet mine—to attack Japanese and Norwegian oil tankers in the Gulf of Oman.

In addition to this threat to international freedom of navigation and commerce, Iran’s Houthi proxies have launched sustained attacks on airports and other infrastructure targets within Saudi Arabia.

In this context, it is clearly in the national interest of the United States to ensure that our allies in the region have the capabilities they need to counter a hostile Iran.

The sweeping scope of this amendment, however, seeks to block all 22 of these arms sales instead of those few that may be of particular concern. For example, it would attempt to prevent the transfer of precision-guided munitions to our allies Jordan, as well as a number of other seemingly non-controversial cases.

Madam Chair, we need to work with our partners in the region to accomplish common objectives on counterterrorism and in deterring Iran, including through timely U.S. defense transfers.

Arbitrarily stopping a large number of arms sales, regardless of their sensitivity, will hinder the ability of our combatant commander to accomplish these goals. It will also undermine the reputation of the United States as a reliable security partner and provide opportunities to China or Russia to erode U.S. influence in the region.
We are a coequal branch of government. We want the executive branch, no matter who is in the executive branch, to respect the fact that we are. That is clear to the people in this House. We have voted that way, and we have talked about it for a long time now.

It is also unfortunate that the Department of State decided to utilize an emergency waiver authority on the arms sales that are the subject of this amendment. Congressional oversight over arms transfers is an important responsibility, and it would have been best had these sensitive matters been handled through the traditional consultative process.

This is not the appropriate vehicle to vindicate those congressional prerogatives. That responsibility rests with the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees, and not in this bill.

Madam Chair, accordingly, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Chair, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from California.

I simply note that the issue here is not whether we should sell arms to our allies, such as Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. The issue is whether Congress should have a role or we are going to be completely bypassed by this administration.

That is all this amendment seeks to do, to have Congress take a role in the way we have always taken a role in arms sales.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VisClosky).

Mr. Visclosky. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the gentleman for offering the amendment.

The operative word here is "bypass." The administration has used an obscure, rarely used provision to skirt congressional oversight of arms sales with Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.

The administration's lack of justification for using this emergency authority with respect to these sales is troubling, especially when you consider much of the equipment contained in these cases would not be delivered for months, as the gentleman from California rightfully pointed out.

Congress is a coequal branch of government that has oversight responsibilities to review such cases before we sell major weapons systems to other countries. These review requirements are on the books for a reason, and this amendment helps to ensure that the law is adhered to and that Congress is respected and can meet its constitutional requirement.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Engel).

Mr. Engel. Madam Chair, I compliment my colleague from California. This is something that is very serious, and obviously, we have been talking about it for a long time now.

As one of only two parties in the agreement, and the only party currently playing by the rules, the U.S. is subject to severe restrictions on our military capabilities faced by no other nation on Earth. This problem is especially acute in Asia, where the U.S. military projects the largest and most distant reach, and at the most challenging ranges, which are likely to have prohibited by the treaty if Beijing were a signatory.

This arsenal puts us on the wrong side of the cost competition. As you can see from this chart from the bipartisan Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, the United States is dangerously outranged at intermediate distances.

No matter how capable or affordable, our ships, fighters, and bombers will never be cheaper than ground-based missiles. This is a recipe for disaster, both in war and in peacetime competition.

Two years ago, to remedy this, Congress began R&D funding for ground-based conventional intermediate missiles. Now that the United States is months away from a post-INF world, Congress is threatening to undo this process by zeroing out R&D for these purely conventional missile systems.

To be clear, early-stage R&D on intermediate missiles is allowable under the treaty. It is why we have been doing it over the past 2 years. The cuts contained in this bill already go beyond what is mandated by the agreement. It would not only keep us from being tied to a treaty that no one else is honoring, but it would also expand the scope of our commitment by blocking R&D funding.

Madam Chair, this is insanity. No other conventional weapons system would ever be held to this standard. We wouldn't do it for tanks. Yet, we are doing it for missiles that would provide credible, dispersed, and lethal firepower.

I understand that my colleagues, some on both sides of the aisle, have concerns on nuclear weapons. I understand. I appreciate that. I would welcome a conversation with any of my colleagues about prohibiting R&D dollars from going toward intermediate-range nuclear.

But despite the INF name, this amendment has nothing to do with nuclear weapons. This is all about conventional deterrence.

Go talk to the men and women who are downsizing in the Indo-Pacific Command who are, on a daily basis, dealing with the real-world ramifications of an increasingly unfavorable...
conventional military balance. They will tell Members, and, indeed, they have told us on the Armed Services Committee, that deploying intermediate-range conventional missiles in Asia would help increase our deterrence and, therefore, improve our ability to avoid war, which is what it is all about.

Madam Chair, I cannot be clear enough. By zeroing out R&D funding for intermediate-range conventional missiles, this bill undermines our ability to be properly deter aggression. Whatever we think about nuclear weapons, these cuts make them more important to American defense planning, not less, by reducing our options to restore growing imbalances in conventional power.

This is a mistake that I fear will cost the United States in more ways than one. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which would restore adequate R&D funding to develop intermediate-range conventional missiles and provide the Department with the flexibility it needs to pursue this critical capability.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I rose in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, the Russians are cheating on the INF Treaty. That does not mean we should compound the first problem by creating a second problem. Don’t make a bad situation worse.

Our energy and focus should remain on diplomacy and multilateral efforts to bring Russia back into compliance with the INF Treaty.

The INF Treaty, which was signed by President Reagan in 1987, established an agreement between the United States, Russia, and a number of other countries to not field ground-launched cruise and ballistic missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers. This treaty was instrumental in arresting the arms race, defusing tensions, and ultimately, bringing an end to the Cold War.

I find it very concerning that, due to the President’s suspension of compliance in February, the INF Treaty will be officially suspended and void on August 2. This was all done without exhausting all diplomatic efforts and with limited congressional input.

The conditions established in the treaty are crucial to European security.

If it disingenuous that the statement of administration policy on this bill implies NATO endorses the U.S. developing an intermediate-range cruise missile capability. The Brussels summit declaration by NATO heads of state and government in July 2018 stated that the INF Treaty has been crucial to Euro-Atlantic security and that we remain fully committed to the preservation of this landmark arms control treaty.

The December 2018 statement by the NATO Foreign Ministers reinforced this by stating that the treaty had been crucial in upholding NATO’s security for over 30 years.

The February 2019 statement by the North Atlantic Council continued to call on Russia to return to compliance with the treaty. It did not endorse the development of INF-violating weapons by the U.S. or any other member of the alliance.

NATO’s official position on the treaty remains that NATO’s focus is to preserve the INF treaty.

There is no question Russia has not upheld its promises as a signatory to the treaty. However, I believe the irresponsible actions of the Russian Government do not require the U.S. to jump headlong into a costly and unnecessary arms race that will promote greater instability, which harkens back to the policies and actions that defined the most perilous phases of the Cold War.

This amendment would negate previous U.S. nonproliferation and arms control efforts. It is neither prudent nor wise.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Chair, I want to quickly say that a treaty that no one else is abiding by is merely a suicide pact with ourselves.

Secondly, even if you disagree with my assessment of the INF, this limits our ability to conduct R&D, which isn’t prohibited by the treaty.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) can now proceed with his amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I will very quickly.

I am shocked: The Russians are cheating.

Now that our treaty obligations are suspended, the United States needs to move forward with developing ground-launched INF missile capability.

Madam Chair, I support the gentleman’s amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for this spirited debate.

I just would ask that we consider what we want the world to look like in a post-INF environment, because that is where we are headed, and we have multiple options we need to pursue. We are limiting ourselves. We are taking a step backward if we do not approve this amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I believe that it is necessary to maintain a credible and effective nuclear deterrence.

I also strongly believe that multilateral diplomatic efforts, including the INF Treaty and other international agreements, that encourage all countries to restrain potentially bad behavior are key elements of U.S. national security.

Beyond this particular amendment, it is my hope that the administration will reconsider its efforts to unilaterally abrogate from our national responsibility to uphold the INF Treaty, and instead, to work with Congress and our allies abroad to address and rectify long-standing arms control concerns with Russia, and other global actors.

I will continue to be a strong advocate for diplomacy and remain a willing and available partner to the administration and our colleagues in regard to this treaty and other important issues.

Madam Chair, I do oppose 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 Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. GALLAGHER

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Chair, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), and 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 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $19,600,000)”.

Page 238, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $19,600,000)”.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Chair, it is my privilege to offer my colleague, Ms. CHENEY’s, amendment to restore badly needed funding for Trident II Modifications relating to low-yield submarine-launched ballistic missile warheads.

This amendment seeks to address an urgent operational requirement. Russia has a nuclear doctrine, known as escalate to deescalate. This doctrine emphasizes using low-yield nuclear weapons against U.S. and allied forces on the battlefield.
As the logic behind this doctrine goes, destroying large portions of NATO forces with low-yield nuclear weapons would leave allied decision-makers with an unenviable decision between accepting Russian conquest and the destruction of NATO or launching strategic nuclear weapons and ushering in a nuclear holocaust.

In other words, they put the onus of escalation and all of the attendant international opprobrium on us. I do know about you, but that does not sound like a good choice to me.

The Nuclear Posture Review is actually clear on this subject: “Expanding flexible U.S. nuclear options now, to include low-yield options, is important for the preservation of credible deterrence against regional aggression...will raise the nuclear threshold and help ensure that potential adversaries perceive no possible advantage in limited nuclear escalation, making nuclear weapons employment less likely.”

Critics may argue that we have already had low-yield weapons in our arsenal and that we do not need a submarine-launched variant. They also argue against displacing strategic weapons with low-yield options in limited missile SSBN missile tubes.

But as the Nuclear Posture Review finds, low-yield weapons provide tangible advantages compared to dual-capable aircraft.

I quote again: “A low-yield SLBM warhead and SLCM will not require or rely on host nation support to provide deterrence and affect. They will provide additional diversity in platforms, range, and survivability, and a valuable hedge against future nuclear ‘break out’ scenarios.”

I just would emphasize, to close, the findings from the Nuclear Posture Review are not partisan. This amendment is actually advancing a bipartisan position.

Former Obama Secretary of Defense Ash Carter has gone on record saying: “My views are reflected in the latest Nuclear Posture Review.”

Jim Miller, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy during the Obama administration, has argued that “Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis’ 2018 Nuclear Posture Review offers continuity with past U.S. policy and plans, including those in the 2010 NPR. It deserves broad bipartisan support. Its proposal for a low-yield SLBM weapon and a new low-yield-tipped sea-launched cruise missile are sensible responses to changed security conditions, especially Russia and North Korea.”

We have heard time and again from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. CALVERT) that this amendment is actually advancing a bipartisan position.

Those who think they are making the world safer by refusing to support the programs should remember the ancient Latin adage, “If you want peace, prepare for war.” That has never been more applicable than in regard to this program.

Madam Chair, this amendment is vital to maintaining deterrence and peace. I would urge my colleagues to support it.

I would point out that the Russians are under the perception that this is a strategic imperative from their perspective. So from my perspective, let’s remove that misconception and vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) for his strong words in support.

Madam Chair, I urge all my colleagues to join us in standing up against Russian aggression.

In order to implement the National Defense Strategy, we have to find a way to move to conventional deterrence by denial as opposed to putting all of our eggs in the basket of strategic deterrence by punishment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, in closing, I wish to emphasize that we should not use the most survivable leg of our triad as a tactical warfighting platform.

It is imperative for the House to reaffirm Ronald Reagan’s clear-eyed admonition that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I urge all my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MS. BLUNT ROCHESTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam 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 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $1,000,000).”

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $1,000,000).”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Delaware.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I urge today in support of my
amendment to the division C Defense appropriations of H.R. 2740.

I applaud my colleagues for including expanded authorities in the fiscal year 2019 National Defense Authorization Act that would allow the Defense Department’s Space-Available Flights program to benefit veterans with 100 percent service-connected disability.

As you may know, the Space-A program offers free military air travel to eligible participants if there is available space on a flight heading to a destination within the continental United States.

Prior to the fiscal year 2019 NDAA, the Space-A program provided Active Duty, reservists, retirees, and certain family members with this benefit. Space-A is an example of programs operated by the military that can and do work for the American people.

Expanding the benefit to include 100 percent disabled veterans was common sense, and will help those veterans visit their friends and family from the service, and even seek services for medical and mental health treatment with the best possible healthcare providers.

For 100 percent disabled veterans in Delaware, the expansion of Space-A offered an especially convenient travel alternative due to the Dover Air Force Base’s central location within the State.

Many such communities across the country are similarly improved thanks to this program.

While the effort to expand access to this program to some of our Nation’s veterans was well-intentioned, I have heard from some veterans that there may have been an unintended consequence.

The new authorities do not allow caregivers or spouses to travel with eligible veterans as part of the program. For many veterans that are rated as 100 percent disabled, the inability to have their caregiver or spouse join them on the flight effectively disqualifies them from utilizing this incredible program.

We must ensure that all eligible veterans have equal and fair access to the benefits they have earned.

President Lincoln made it clear that it is our country’s duty to care and assist those that had borne the battle on behalf of the country, and it is our duty as a country to follow through on that promise.

That is why I request that the Department of Defense provide to Congress an assessment of feasibility or possible issues in expanding eligible participants to include spouses and caregivers when traveling with 100 percent disabled veterans.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on improving this benefit afforded to these veterans.

Mr. VISCOLSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCOLSKY. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I commend the gentleman for her work with the committee to make all of us aware of the lack of support that our veterans lack when facing the space-available flights. I am happy to report that, because of congressional actions such as hers and her adamant action on this behalf, the Department is updating their air transportation eligibility requirements to expand space-available privileges in no little reason because of the gentleman’s actions, and I do support her amendment.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlement from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

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

Mr. ROY. Madam 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 Delaware will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam 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 C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 91. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for continued research on the Long-Range Standoff missile (LRSO).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman VISCLOSKY for his leadership on the Defense appropriations bill, as well as Mr. MCGOVERN, our Rules Committee chair, for making this amendment in order.

My amendment deals with one particular piece of the administration’s escalation of our nuclear warfighting capability, and that is the long-range standoff weapon, or LRSO. This new nuclear-armed cruise missile does not add to our country’s already strong strategic deterrent. Instead, it performs a redundant purpose that can already be accomplished with the standoff capability of other weapons systems.

The CBO estimates that, over 10 years, canceling the production of this weapon would save us about $13 billion.

That is $13 billion that could go into education or infrastructure or healthcare or housing or even investments in foreign assistance and diplomacy that would actually keep us safer.

I am deeply concerned, Madam Chair, that continuing to pour more and more money into building up our nuclear arsenal puts us down a dangerous course. Just this past weekend, we found ourselves in yet another escalation of tensions with Iran, with the Secretary of State saying that the tension is “considering a full range of options,” including military options in response to the attack on two tankers in the Gulf of Oman. And just last night, President Trump announced that he is sending another 1,000 American troops to the Middle East.

Meanwhile, let me remind my colleagues that this administration has recklessly torn up former President Reagan’s Intermediate-Range Nuclear force INF Treaty with Russia, pulled out of President Obama’s historic nonproliferation accord with Iran, and escalated inflammatory tensions and rhetoric with some of the world’s most powerful nuclear-armed states.

The President’s agenda outlined in his 2018 nuclear posture review would also resurrect former nuclear capabilities that bipartisan administrations have wisely eliminated. According to many expert observers, some of the upgrades made to our nuclear program in the past few years could be interpreted as plans for a “first strike.”

Let me be clear, the Trump administration’s plan to develop the LRSO cruise missile is not only wasteful, but potentially dangerous. It will make our country, in my opinion, less safe. The weapon is expected to be significantly more capable than the cruising system it is replacing. It will be likely harder to detect, have a longer range, fly faster, and be more accurate. The weapon will also be deployed on advancing penetrating bombers, which are less detectable and designed to infiltrate enemy air defenses.

In contrast, the system that the LRSO is replacing is only carried by the B-52, which flies relatively slowly and is easily spotted by radar. As a result, the new cruise missile and bomber could allow attacks on an array of targets without being detected first, and that could lead to treaty-waiting miscalculation and, potentially, to accidental nuclear war.

Madam Chair, don’t just take my word for it. Let me tell you that former Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis stated that he is not sold on the LRSO. Why are we appropriating money to something that the former Secretary of Defense for the Republican administration is not sold on?

The ALCM is a nuclear-armed air-launched cruise missile that is used to engage targets on the ground. It is a part of the U.S. strategic triad, which includes submarine-launched ballistic missiles and ICBMs. The ALCM has been in service for over 35 years and is considered outdated and vulnerable to modern air defenses. The U.S. Strategic Command has expressed concerns about its effectiveness and the need to develop a new missile system, the LRSO, to replace it.

In his remarks, Mr. Visclosky highlighted the need for sustained funding for the LRSO program. He noted that the ALCM is 35 years old and is obsolete. He argued that the LRSO program is essential for maintaining the U.S. nuclear deterrent and ensuring the nation's security. The LRSO is a long-range standoff weapon that can deliver a low-yield nuclear warhead, providing a more flexible and potent nuclear deterrent.

Mr. Visclosky emphasized the importance of effective deterrence and the role it plays in maintaining peace. He noted that the current landscape buffer around military installations is critical for providing the necessary space for military operations to proceed unimpeded and for ensuring the protection of our natural habitats.

In conclusion, Mr. Visclosky argued that the LRSO program is a necessary investment in our national security and our natural environment. He called for continued support for the program and for the Department of Defense to prioritize the preservation of our natural landscapes near military installations.
Program can have on the installations and the community. By working with partners like the Trust for Public Land and the Colorado Department of Military and Veterans Affairs, the City of Aurora, the REPI Program was able to preserve nearly 300 acres of land.

The environmental protection and antiencroachment measures undertaken at Buckley have protected agricultural and recreational lands while ensuring that Buckley Air Force Base has the land required to conduct operations into the future. The AEDC community continues to fight for language to benefit the installation.

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

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am not in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment, I just find it unnecessary. There is robust funding in the bill for this activity to fight encroachment on our military bases, and that is really kind of between the local government and the local State and local groups.

Madam Chair, I make that point, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman yielding again. I think the gentleman is doing good work here. The gentleman is correct that there was an increase of $2 million from last year’s fiscal year in our bill; however, it was a $12 million increase from the administration’s request, so I do applaud him for his work.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I am preparing to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, I want to take the opportunity to speak about how the REPI program saves taxpayer dollars, supports military readiness, and preserves our environment.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment for an additional $13 million that is in line with the amount authorized in the NDAA that was marked up last week to ensure its valuable work can benefit more and even grow to meet additional needs for decades to come.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. CROW

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 60 printed in part A of House Report 116–111. Mr. CROW. Madam 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 248, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $20,000,000)”.

Page 249, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $20,000,000)”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to vastly increase funding for ALS research by $40 million through the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs at the Department of Defense. This is to build on the program’s vision to improve treatments and find a cure for this disease, which poses far more questions than answers.

In the United States, 15 people are diagnosed with ALS every day, with an estimated 16,000 Americans living with the disease. Commonly referred to as Lou Gehrig’s disease, the average survival time after diagnosis is only 3 years.

Although an estimated 10 percent of ALS cases are inherited, more than 90 percent are sporadic, and medical research can’t yet determine why. It is further complicated for veterans, as research suggests that there is a mutually inclusive relationship between ALS and military service. In fact, veterans who were deployed during the Gulf war are twice as likely to develop ALS.

This disease also hits home for me in many ways. On March 18, our community lost Mike Cimbera to ALS. Mike was, first and foremost, a loving husband and father, but on top of that, he fought ALS ferociously to ensure that ALS will no longer be a hopeless diagnosis. He worked to get right-to-try legislation across the finish line to increase access to experimental treatments that would one day cure this disease.

In my own family, we lost our dear cousin, Jeff Van Brunt, to this disease last year. Jeff would have just celebrated his 40th birthday. He left behind his wonderful wife, Jill, and kids, Megan, William, Sophia, and Mark.

In short, this disease knows no stranger, impacting communities and families across the country. This disease continues to take loved ones in our communities every day, and we need to continue to fight for funding to find treatments and a cure.

I am extremely grateful to the chairman and his entire team for working to increase funding this year, but I want to be clear that we need to attack this disease more aggressively.

It costs between $1 billion and $2 billion to find a treatment for ALS and can take up to 15 years to bring an effective ALS treatment to market. Furthermore, finding a path to finding cures for other diseases, like Parkinson’s, Alzheimer’s, multiple sclerosis, and many others.

We owe this to our veterans. We owe this to every member of our community who should not have to face this disease without any hope for a cure.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time, and I withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. COX OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in part A of House Report 116–111. Mr. COX of California. Madam 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 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by $10,000,000)”.

Page 248, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $10,000,000)”.

Page 249, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by $10,000,000)”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. COX of California. Madam Chair, I thank the distinguished chairman as well as the distinguished ranking member for the great work with respect to this legislation.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which makes a modest adjustment to H.R. 2740. My amendment would increase funding for the Department of Defense Health Program by $10 million. This amendment is budget-neutral by reducing the Department of Defense’s, the DOD’s, Department-wide operation maintenance fund by the same amount.

The Defense Health Program oversees all medical and healthcare programs for the DOD, and the modification made by my amendment would ensure the Department has sufficient resources to fund vital medical research concerning traumatic brain injury, TBI; post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD, and psychological health. This research would aid servicemembers and civilians alike.

Over the past 10 years, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of servicemembers reported to have PTSD, and we see these increases in both active and nonactive servicemembers.

Since 2001, over 2.7 million service members have served in war zones in
Iraq and Afghanistan, and of those, 300,000 have been diagnosed with TBI. And the DOD estimates that 22 percent of all combat casualties in Iraq and Afghanistan are brain injuries.

The cost of war not only harms our service members but also the spouses, the parents, the children, and the families, who have hoped and prayed for the safe return of their loved ones. Unfortunately, we have discovered that the battle when the service members return home with a PTSD, a TBI, or other nonphysical injury.

Furthermore, whether or not PTSD is a greater risk to female veterans than male veterans is still largely unknown, and as women continue to serve in more active roles in the war and are increasingly exposed to combat situations, their likelihood of experiencing a PTSD, naturally, will rise. So more research is better understood to and funds appropriated for research and other need-based care and services to provide the necessary treatment before symptoms of PTSD become chronic.

As many may have seen, just on Sunday night, there were a number of innovative solutions, like stellate ganglion block or SGB, that are currently being investigated and can be considered game changers in PTSD treatment. So, by investing in new groundbreaking technologies and therapies and trials, we can, by providing access to leading-edge microelectronics cybersecurity, ensure quick, reliable, and secure access to leading-edge microelectronics is often a challenge. The changing global semiconductor industry and the increasing sophistication of U.S. adversaries require us to update our domestic microelectronics security framework by establishing a comprehensive, public-private partnership-structured microelectronics cybersecurity center. This center can provide the defense industrial base with access to manufacturing resources to support antitamper devices, hardware security, and other evolving new concept technologies that support trusted and assured manufacturing, combined with advanced system integration and packaging technologies.

I am further troubled by the Department’s lack of transparency into how these reforms all but guarantees this will not be the case. In South Carolina, we are, unfortunately, already feeling the effects.

Naval Hospital Beaufort provides quality care to an estimated 35,000 servicemembers, retirees, and military families in South Carolina. Just last month, the Department eliminated the naval hospital’s urgent care services. Given the administration’s plan to eliminate another 18,000 medical billets nationwide, I am deeply concerned about the effect that further cuts may have on our military and their families.

As a result, military families in under-served communities face an uncertain future. In Beaufort County, my constituents already face unreasonable wait times to see their doctors. Given the high concentration of defense reforms in my district, any reduction in services on Naval Hospital Beaufort is certain to further reduce access to care and degrade unit readiness in the Lowcountry.

I thank the committee for its attention to this issue, and I ask that it continues to work with me to ensure servicemembers, retirees, and their families can continue to have access to the care that they need and deserve.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman in this regard, and I share his concerns. I would simply point out for the Record that, in the committee’s markup, we have increased funding for this, before the gentleman's amendment, by 24 percent over last year's level.

Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

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

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

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

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings are postponed.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Visclosky) for yielding.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.
It has been a great experience. I also thank all the staff for the great work that they have done on both the majority and the minority.

I do want to point out one thing to the chairman. There is going to be a meeting tomorrow at the White House, hopefully without a budget agreement. Hope springs eternal, but, hopefully, we can get a budget agreement with the White House, the House, and the Senate so that we don’t have to go into sequester later this year, which, as the gentleman knows, would be a disaster for the United States military. Let’s wish them well as they try to work out an agreement.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Acting CHAIR is Mr. Horsford.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the motion that the Committee rise.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I request a recorded vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 317, noes 82, answered “present” 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

AYES—317

Adams
Aguiar
Allen
Alford
Alombri
Amodei
Armstrong
Bacon
Baird
Baldissero
Banks
Barrett
Burr
Barragan
Braun
Beatty
Bera
Berman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bommarito
Boe
Boyle, Brendan
Boyer
Brady
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Buchon
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Casten (IL)
Castronova
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Coley
Conaway
Cook
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lea (CA)
Lesko
Lewis
Lien, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Logan
Long
Loudmilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Lujan
Luzum
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Mica
Miller
Mitchell
Loebsack
Moore
Morelle
Morrell-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Napoli
Naples
Neal
Nogowski
Newhouse
Norcross
Nunnelee
O’Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Aderholt
Amash
Arrington
Bakari
Bass
Bassett
Baumgartner
Bates
Baxley
Beatty
Bergman
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bommarito
Boe
Boyle, Brendan
Brady
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Buchon
Butterfield
Calvert
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Casten (IL)
Castronova
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Coley
Conaway
Cook
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lea (CA)
Lesko
Lewis
Lien, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Logan
Long
Loudmilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Lujan
Luzum
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Mica
Miller
Mitchell
Loebsack
Moore
Morelle
Morrell-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Napoli
Naples
Neal
Nogowski
Newhouse
Norcross
Nunnelee
O’Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Aderholt
Amash
Arrington
Bakari
Bass
Bassett
Baumgartner
Bates
Baxley
Beatty
Bergman
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bommarito
Boe
Boyle, Brendan
Brady
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Buchon
Butterfield
Calvert
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Casten (IL)
Castronova
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Coley
Conaway
Cook
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lea (CA)
Lesko
Lewis
Lien, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Logan
Long
Loudmilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Lujan
Luzum
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Mica
Miller
Mitchell
Loebsack
Moore
Morelle
Morrell-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Napoli
Naples
Neal
Nogowski
Newhouse
Norcross
Nunnelee
O’Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Aderholt
Amash
Arrington
Bakari
Bass
Bassett
Baumgartner
Bates
Baxley
Beatty
Bergman
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bommarito
Boe
Boyle, Brendan
Brady
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Buchon
Butterfield
Calvert
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Casten (IL)
Castronova
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Coley
Conaway
Cook
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lea (CA)
Lesko
Lewis
Lien, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Logan
Long
Loudmilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Lujan
Luzum
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Ms. PORTER, Messrs. GALLAGHER, BYRNE, Mr. DEGETTE, Messrs. CISNEROS, KELLY of Mississippi, JOHNSON of Louisiana, GUEST, COLLINS of New York, ROUZER, BURCHETT, and AMASH changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. HIMES, Mses. GARCIA of Texas, WATERSON COLEMAN, Mr. COLE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. LONG, BLUMENAUER, and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to rise was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOWENTHAL) having assumed the chair, Mr. HORSEFORD, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported that the 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 designates the Clerk to call the roll of the House for the purpose of recording the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk redesignates the amendment.

The Clerk redesignates the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 225, not voting 25, as follows:

{The roll call is not transcribed in this text.}