United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 2019 No. 104

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 20, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

MISSING AND MURDERED INDIGENOUS WOMEN

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on a crisis that affects communities across our Nation. That crisis is that of missing and murdered indigenous women.

Native American and Alaska Native women throughout the country face a murder rate 10 times that of the national average, with 84 percent experiencing some kind of violence in their lifetime.

In my home State of Washington, Native Americans make up about 2 percent of the population, but a recent report by the Washington State Patrol shows that indigenous women account for 7 percent of the State's reported missing women.

My congressional district in Central Washington sits at the epicenter of this crisis. In the past 5 years alone, seven women have been murdered or have gone missing on or near the Yakama Nation reservation.

These women are not just statistics in a database. They are mothers, daughters, sisters, neighbors, and friends. There are those who are missing, like 25-year-old Alillia Minthorn, or Lala as her friends called her, who was last seen in Toppenish and has been missing since May 5; 31-year-old Rosenda Strong, who was last seen in Wapato on October 2 of last year; 34-year-old Freda Gun, who went missing in Kennewick in 2016; and 18-year-old Rosalita Longee, who was last seen in Wapato in 2015.

Then there are the unsolved murders, including 23-year-old Linda Dave, whose remains were found in Toppenish in February of 2017; 31-year-old Minnie Andy, who was assaulted by an unknown assailant in Wapato, and later died of her injuries in July of 2017; and 23-year-old Destiny Lloyd, who was reported missing on Christmas Day 2017, only to be found days later, murdered, on the side of the road.

To reiterate, Madam Speaker, these are just seven cases from the last 5 years. There are currently 71 open cases like this in Washington State; 31 of them occurring on or near the Yakama Nation reservation.

The local community has been working to tackle this crisis. Tribal and community leaders have held multiple rallies and community forums to raise awareness and demand action.

The diligent reporting of the Yakima Herald-Republic has highlighted the community response and activism on the ground, creating an online hub to list open cases involving missing and murdered Yakama Nation women and providing resources for the community to report disappearances.

Recently passed State laws, spearheaded by State Representative Gina Mosbrucker in Olympia, have enhanced data collection and improved communication between Tribal leaders and various State agencies.

I absolutely applaud these efforts, and I am inspired by the progress being made at the local and State level; however, this is a national problem that requires a national response. That is why I, along with my colleagues, Representatives TORRES and HAALAND, introduced Savanna's Act.

Our legislation aims to address and bring awareness to the crisis of missing and murdered indigenous women at the Federal level by improving coordination between Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies. The bill would develop guidelines and best practices for Tribes and law enforcement agencies across the country to enhance the reporting and record-keeping of crimes against indigenous women and improve communication between law enforcement and families of victims.

Now, this bill may sound familiar. Last Congress, the Senate unanimously passed a version of Savanna's Act that stalled in the House. Representatives TORRES, HAALAND, and I worked with Tribes, advocacy groups, law enforcement, and Senators MURKOWSKI and CORTEZ MASTO to improve the legislation and introduce a bill that can—and should—be signed into law.

The bill is named in honor of Savanna LaFontaine-Greywind, a 22-year-old member of the Spirit Lake Tribe, pregnant with her first child, who was murdered in August of 2017. Her murder

Printed on recycled paper.

brought long-overdue national attention to missing and murdered indigenous women.

After meeting with local families of victims, State and local law enforcement, and regional Tribes, it has become clear to me that central Washington has a unique perspective on this crisis.

The stories about these women are heartbreaking. It is with these stories and mine that I have urged both House Judiciary and Natural Resources Committees to hold a field hearing on the Yakama Nation reservation to learn firsthand how this crisis is plaguing our communities.

I am pleased to have gained the support of local Tribes and the YWCA in Yakima in calling for a field hearing, and I am eager to have committee members hear their stories as well.

Thankfully, justice was served upon Savanna's murderers. We owe the same justice for the many murdered, missing, indigenous women.

SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM AND CONSTITUENT GERALDINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues the story of one of my constituents, Geraldine, as a reminder that the work that we do here on the floor impacts people's lives.

Geraldine received assistance from the Senior Community Service Employment Program, which is also known as SCSEP.

We provided $464 million to SCSEP in the minibus package that we passed yesterday, H.R. 2740. The bill included fiscal year 2020 funding for critical programs at the Department of Labor that help Americans like Geraldine find jobs and gain new skills in their journey to become reemployed, programs like Job Corps, Registered Apprenticeship, YouthBuild, and, of course, SCSEP.

Geraldine is a perfect example of why this funding is so important. She is a mother and a grandmother and the main provider for her granddaughter and two grandchildren.

When the financial crisis of 2008 hit, she lost her job, a devastating moment for her family's only source of income. She quietly retired, but like far too many Americans, she did not have enough savings to stop working.

Her family needed her, and she needed to find work, a task made difficult with her age, existing skill set, and, now, gap in employment. Fortunately, Geraldine was able to take advantage of SCSEP through Easterseals in New Jersey.

Created by the Older Americans Act of 1965, the Senior Community Service Employment Program has helped low income, unemployed seniors learn new, in-demand skills and reenter the workforce for more than 50 years. Participants enrolled in SCSEP receive a subsidized minimum wage for work at a nonprofit agency while learning skills to help them reenter the workforce.

But SCSEP does more than just skills training. Its greatest success is helping seniors regain their sense of confidence and self-fulfillment. Some programs have services that help seniors get glasses or even pay rent and utility bills.

Geraldine shared this with me, that SCSEP was instrumental in helping her regain her sense of purpose. She was so successful in her program, that she was offered a position at Easterseals to support new participants in the program through their own journeys to reemployment, people who were previously in the same position as she.

Increasingly, seniors like Geraldine have become the primary caretakers for their grandchildren. This is especially true for places that have been ravaged by the opioid crisis.

That is why it is so important that we support more programs at SCSEP at the Department of Labor. There are countless seniors out there with nowhere to turn. SCSEP is one of the answers that gets them back to work.

Madam Speaker, before I close, I want to share with you one last anecdote from Geraldine.

She shared with me her story about a boy in her community who didn't want to throw away broken crayons. In defiance of his dad, this little boy said even broken crayons still color just as brightly as ever. Geraldine says that she sees herself in broken crayons and knows that her colors shine just as brightly as any others.

We must ensure that critical programs like SCSEP are fully funded as grandparents across America are increasingly becoming the primary breadwinners in their families.

I am proud that my colleagues and I voted to pass H.R. 2740 yesterday, and as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, I am committed to advocating for more programs that support our seniors.

NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, Tuesday morning, I had the honor of being in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, at the State capitol to speak about my bill, Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act. The House Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee at the State legislature hosted a panel to discuss my legislation that would increase milk options in school lunchrooms across the country.

Later that morning, we gathered in the capitol rotunda with State lawmakers and representatives of the dairy industry, dairy farm families from throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to rally in support of putting whole milk back in our schools.

Madam Speaker, dairy products like milk contain 9 essential nutrients that can help reduce your risk of high blood pressure, osteoporosis, and certain cancers. It is helpful with weight management. And whether it is protein to help build and repair muscle tissue of active bodies or Vitamin A to help maintain healthy skin, dairy products are a natural nutrient powerhouse.

I was especially glad to participate in these events, because June is National Dairy Month.

Proudly, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is one of the largest milk-producing States in the Nation, and this annual tradition celebrates the contributions the dairy industry and dairy farm families have made to the world. It is my hope that, through this legislation, we will be able to allow students to select the type of milk that they love best, including flavored and whole milk.

This legislation is in response to changes made in 2010 to the School Lunch Program. That year, the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act amended the nutrition standards and mandated that flavored milk must be fat-free.

This law, along with the lowest participation in the program, led to an alarming decline in milk consumption in schools since 2010. Declining milk consumption in schools not only impacts students where they don't get the nutrition that they need, but also the dairy farm families in rural communities across the Nation.

In addition to the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act, I recently introduced another bill with Congressman JOE COURTNEY to expand milk options for students and reverse the decline of milk consumption in schools. The School Milk Nutrition Act of 2019 reaffirms and codifies a recent regulation from the USDA by providing schools with the option to serve lowfat milk with flavor, and it requires that milk offered is consistent with the most recent dietary guidelines for Americans.

In November of 2017, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced regulatory changes for the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs, including a provision that provides schools with the option to serve lowfat 1 percent flavored milk.

□ 0915

I urge my colleagues to sign on to these bills during National Dairy Month and allow our students the option of consuming the type of milk that they love with the nutrition that they need.

I thank the Pennsylvania lawmakers and members of the dairy industry who stood together in Harrisburg on Tuesday in support of the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act.

Milk is the official beverage of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I hope we will soon allow students everywhere the option to drink whole milk with their lunches, should they choose to enjoy it.

ABANDON PLAN FOR ANTI-IMMIGRANT PUBLIC CHARGE RULE

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to demand that the Trump administration stop its assault on immigrant communities and abandon its plan on public charge.

Now let me be clear: No one should be denied a visa due to their possible, potential need for public assistance, also known as public charge. It is beyond appalling that the Department of Homeland Security is using this criterion to prevent deserving families from coming to the United States.

This heartless and un-American proposed rule also makes it extremely difficult for individuals who are seeking a new life in the United States to receive a green card if they are considered likely to use public benefits in the future.

If this rule is implemented, the Trump administration would expand the list of programs to include SNAP, Medicaid, and housing assistance to determine permanent residency.

Madam Speaker, basic programs are there to help struggling families put food on the table and keep a roof over their heads when they need it. Denying immigrant families green card status with this criterion is just plain wrong.

This anti-immigrant rhetoric is not new, Madam Speaker. For over 100 years, the Federal Government has used the argument of public charge in immigration law for inadmissibility or deportation. Public charge was first created when the 47th Congress passed the Immigration Act of 1882. This restricted certain individuals from migrating to the United States.

This legislation specifically targeted unmarried women who were presumed to be a so-called public charge because employers would not employ them, leading the government to take care of them, which is ridiculous.

But it wasn't just women that this law targeted. It was also immigrants from Asia. As many of us are aware, fear of Chinese laborers was part of the anti-immigrant rhetoric of the time. There was widespread fear of the Chinese influence on the economy and the racist perception that these immigrants would not contribute to American society.

This fear was compounded when Chinese immigrants started to bring their families to America and use public infrastructure, such as schools and hospitals.

One of my constituents, Dr. Elaine Kim, who lives in Berkeley, California, experienced this discrimination firsthand. In her own words, she said: ''I am 76, and I am a child of immigrants who arrived in this country in 1903 and 1926, respectively. My parents were not allowed by law to become naturalized citizens and faced very serious racial discrimination in their lifetimes. But they both worked hard, harder than most native-born Americans, all their lives. They contributed importantly to the United States and never, ever caused any legal, social, or economic problems to anyone in this country.

''At 76, I have also worked hard and consider myself a model U.S. citizen. Putting myself through school at a time when most women, and certainly most women of color, faced many obstacles, I finally finished a Ph.D. degree. I served the public for 44 years until I recently retired.

''When I was an impoverished single mother, I received help from both the Maternity and Infant Care Project and unemployment insurance. Now, after working hard and raising a family of hardworking, well-educated children, I receive a modest Social Security check each month as well as Medicare, though I have kept myself in good enough health as to not need much from this entitlement program.''

Dr. Kim and her family came to the United States and contributed greatly to our Nation. They used public benefits when hardships occurred, but they paid it back in many ways when they no longer needed the benefits to help their family get by.

The Trump administration is trying to create discriminatory policies that would restrict families such as Dr. Kim's from even entering the country. This harmful, xenophobic argument evokes fear and scapegoats immigrant communities.

Let's get straight to the facts. This country was built and continues to stand on the strength of immigrants. We know that a little help for our hardworking immigrant families reaps exponential returns to our economy and society.

Immigrants contribute in taxes, and they should be able to use social services when they need it, just like every other person in our Nation who pays taxes. Our immigrant community should not be seen as a drain on America but as an investment in our future. We are one Nation.

In closing, I want to reiterate that it is the constitutional duty of Congress to write our immigration laws and ensure that they are equitable to all individuals, regardless of race, age, or socioeconomic status. That is why, last week, during the Homeland Security appropriations markup, I offered an amendment along with Congressmen PRICE, POCAN, and AGUILAR that would make it clear that no Federal funds can be used to expand public charge.

We must defeat this anti-immigrant and un-American public charge rule. I hope that all of my colleagues will stand up and demand that the administration abandon this plan once and for all.

TANKER ATTACKS DON'T JUSTIFY U.S. MILITARY ACTION AGAINST IRAN

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, recent Persian Gulf tanker attacks do not—I repeat, do not—justify unilateral American military action against Iran.

On May 12, 2019, two Saudi Arabian tankers, a United Arab Emirates tanker, and a Norwegian tanker were attacked. According to a Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, and Norway joint report, explosions caused all four vessels to suffer hull breaches.

The report states that limpet mines were ''highly likely placed by divers below or at the waterline,'' and the placement of the mines was ''consistent with intention to disable the mobility, but not physically destroy, each vessel.''

The report concludes that ''these sophisticated attacks were most likely carried out by a state actor.'' For emphasis, the report does not accuse anyone of conducting the attacks.

On June 13, 2019, a Japanese tanker and Norwegian tanker were attacked with explosive devices that caused considerable fire and hull damage to both tankers.

Who is responsible for these two tanker attacks? There is international disagreement.

America and the United Kingdom blame Iran. Iran denies responsibility. Other nations offer no opinion and caution against a rush to judgment. Perhaps more evidence will persuade the international community that Iran orchestrated these tanker attacks, perhaps not.

Regardless of blame, there are other factors to consider. For example, what is America's national security interest in these six tanker attacks? Not a single attacked tanker is owned by Americans. Rather, they are owned by Saudi Arabia, Norway, the United Arab Emirates, and Japan.

Not a single attacked tanker involved oil produced in America. Rather, all six tankers were shipping Saudi Arabian or United Arab Emirates oil. Neither of the two tankers loaded with cargo was bound for the United States.

Hence, the United States has no national security interest in the six attacked tankers sufficient to trigger an American retaliatory military action against Iran.

There are, however, other nations that do have a national security interest in these tanker attacks. Japan and South Korea import roughly 80 percent of their oil from the Persian Gulf. India imports roughly 60 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf. China imports roughly 50 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf. Western Europe imports almost 20 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf.

Hence, Japan, South Korea, China, India, Western Europe, and many other

nations all have a national security interest in keeping Persian Gulf oil shipping lanes open and are justified in using military force to defend those shipping lanes at their own risk and at their own cost.

Similarly, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates all have a national security interest in keeping Persian Gulf shipping lanes open to transport the oil they produce and sell. Hence, each of these countries is justified in using military force to defend their shipping lanes at their own risk and at their own cost.

Clearly, then, other nations have a far greater national security interest in Persian Gulf oil and shipping lanes than does the United States. As such, these nations should be primarily responsible for using military force as is necessary to protect their national security interests.

Madam Speaker, America must stop being the world's policeman on every corner of the planet. America must stop burning through our treasury and risking our American lives when we have no compelling security interest in a dispute. This is particularly true when those nations that do have a national security interest don't care enough about their own national security interest to protect them.

While America can and should help our allies, it is equally important that America's allies put up their own defense capabilities, protect their own national security interests, and shoulder their own share of military burdens.

If countries with a national security interest in Persian Gulf shipping lanes act as a unified force to protect them, and if they ask for America's assistance, America should then, and only then, consider military assistance. Unless that happens, this is not America's fight.

Of course, should Iran attack Americans or their property, or should Iran attack and kill any of our allies' citizens, an entirely different set of considerations come into play, and Iran will not like America's response to those kinds of attacks.

COMMEMORATING OKLAHOMANS IN SPACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about Oklahomans in space.

Born in Oklahoma's Fifth Congressional District in Shawnee, retired Air Force Colonel Gordon Cooper was one of the first Mercury astronauts. In 1962, he served as a backup for the *Sigma 7* mission. A year later, he circled Earth 22 times in the space capsule *Faith 7*, completing the sixth and last of the Mercury manned spaceflights.

He also served as a command pilot of *Gemini 5* on an 8-day endurance mission. This not only made him the first person to make two orbital flights, but he also set an endurance record on this mission of nearly 191 hours.

Before becoming an astronaut with NASA, Colonel Cooper earned a commission with the U.S. Army in the late 1940s and then transferred to the Air Force where he received a bachelor of science degree in aeronautics from the Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio.

If you visit the National Portrait Gallery in D.C., you will see a picture of Colonel Cooper as one of NASA's Mercury Seven astronauts. I am proud to honor his memory, legacy, and history-making achievements in space.

Madam Speaker, women astronauts from Oklahoma have also made critical contributions to our Nation's space program. Jerrie Cobb and Shannon Lucid are two of those pioneers who paved the way in space and aeronautics.

Cobb is considered one of the most gifted female pilots in history and a fierce advocate for women astronauts. Born in Norman, Oklahoma, and a graduate from Oklahoma City's Classen High School, Cobb became the first woman to fly in the Paris Air Show and was among the first women certified to be an astronaut as a member of the little-known Mercury 13 in the early 1960s. She testified before Congress in 1962, urging lawmakers to allow women to go into space.

□ 0930

Though she never got to leave the Earth's atmosphere, Cobb helped pave the way for future generations of women astronauts like fellow Oklahoman and astronaut, Dr. Shannon Lucid. I pause to honor the memory of Dr. Cobb today, as she passed away 3 months ago at the age of 88.

Lady astronaut Dr. Shannon Lucid, a Congressional District Five resident, graduated from Bethany High School. Among the first six women astronauts selected by NASA, Dr. Lucid became an astronaut in 1979. Not only did she fly on five spaceflights, she is also the only American woman to serve aboard the Mir Space Station.

Before Peggy Whitson broke the record of the number of hours in space, Dr. Lucid set the record with 5,354 hours in space. In December of 1996, she became the first woman to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor for her record-breaking service aboard the Mir, and she retired from NASA in 2012.

Because of the glass ceiling shattered by Jerrie Cobb and Dr. Shannon Lucid, generations of women can and do now follow in their footsteps.

HONORING FRANK LAMERE

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Frank LaMere, who died last Sunday night.

A member of the Winnebago Tribe, Frank was proud of his heritage and worked tirelessly for the Native American community. Frank spent the majority of his life fighting for Native American causes and, as a result, was known across Nebraska and other States for his determined efforts.

I had the opportunity of interacting with Frank for several years and was always impressed by the civility he showed, his respect for others, and, most of all, how considerate and thoughtful he was.

Frank had an interest in politics and policy and sought to build relationships with folks on both sides of the aisle. He was devoted to making life better for others and was a role model in his civic engagement.

Frank will be dearly missed, but the people of South Sioux City, Nebraska, and the entire State will remember him for his loyalty, his passion, and his ability to build friendships along the way.

Madam Speaker, I offer my condolences to his family and community.

WAR POWERS RESIDE IN THE U.S. CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. And still I rise, Madam Speaker, because I love my country and because I have reason to be concerned, and I believe that every American has reason to be concerned about the issue that I shall address today.

Those of us who are in the House of Representatives should be especially concerned because the issue involves war and peace. It involves the sons and daughters of Mr. and Mrs. America—war and peace.

We have, by and through our Chief Executive Officer, the President of the United States of America, caused a *Nimitz*-class battle group to go into the Gulf region.

For those who do not know, this is the ultimate expression of American military prowess, a *Nimitz*-class battle group. Above it, we have the generationally reliable B–52 bomber. They can rain lethality on anything within their range. Beneath the battle group, you have, lurking, a submarine that can launch without surfacing.

But the centerpiece of a *Nimitz*-class battle group, especially this one, is the USS *Abraham Lincoln*. The *Abraham Lincoln* is an aircraft carrier that is 1,092 feet long. It can carry 90 fixed- and rotary-winged aircraft. The *Abraham Lincoln* has two A–4 Westinghouse nuclear reactors. When it is fueled and it is sent out on a mission, it does not have to come back for 25 years. It is the centerpiece of American military prowess.

To borrow a term from where I grew up, you don't send the *Abraham Lincoln* if you are shucking. You send it when

you are not bluffing. You don't send the *Abraham Lincoln*, Madam Speaker, unless you want to make a statement.

This is the ultimate in American military prowess. It has the ability to rain lethality unlike the human mind can imagine. This is the *Abraham Lincoln*, a *Nimitz*-class aircraft carrier, a part of a battle group. It is the equivalent of sending a military base. You don't send it to bluff.

This is why we must be concerned. We have to be concerned because, if you send it because you are bluffing, Madam Speaker, you are playing with American military prowess; and if you send it because you are going to use it, you have to come to Congress. Congress has to give the word.

We don't play with this kind of lethality. There is a reality associated with this lethality that we cannot imagine. We have no way of predicting what can happen if we use this ultimate form of military force.

We obviously have it to defend ourselves and defend our allies. I don't object to the defensive nature of military action, but I am concerned if you send in this level of lethality because you are bluffing.

So I am calling on all Americans to please pay attention to what is happening in the Gulf region, and I am saying to my brethren and my sisters here in Congress: We are going to regret it if this level of lethality is being used and we did not exercise our duty, our obligation, and our responsibility to review impeachment of this President. We are going to regret it if it happens.

This is the ultimate in lethality. You don't send it because you are bluffing. It is time for us to do what we should do here in this Congress: require an Authorization for Use of Military Force; make sure that we play our role in this process. This is the Congress. We declare war. Don't let all of our authority be usurped by the executive branch.

We ought to have some sense of duty to what the Constitution requires of us. We see what is coming, and we are going to regret it if this ultimate in lethality is utilized in this Gulf region for a bluff that, unfortunately, was called.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANK LAMERE

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I rise today to honor the life of Frank LaMere. Frank LaMere was a leader for the Winnebagos, who had land on both sides of the Missouri River in the Sioux City area, and also for Native Americans, especially in the upper Midwest.

Over the years, our lives interacted multiple times. I had the opportunity to work with him and see the gentleness of his nature.

I will say that he mellowed out in his later years, but he never let up. He never took his foot off the throttle. He just found a smoother way to get to the goals, which were to help out his Native American people.

He was a model of dedication to selflessness, and he also had more than his fair share of tragedy, loss, and demons to fight.

Over the course of his life, he demonstrated that no matter the obstacles, he could rise above them, as we could rise above those and do the most good we can with the tools we have to work with.

He overcame addiction himself. He had dedicated his life to being a voice for the voiceless, including securing housing, food, and other necessities for the people whom he did such a good job representing in the area.

Yet, tragedy still exists in our communities, and Frank LaMere saw the need to address those situations. We collaborated on a couple of important things together. They were the passions of Frank LaMere who passed away on Sunday evening.

The imagination and the dream that he had was to build Hope Street, which would be a treatment center and housing center primarily for Native Americans who are drug addicted or alcohol addicted.

That project, by the way, has the language that allows it to qualify in this appropriations bill that we have before us this week.

Also, the second project that was a very, very important project was when Frank and I had a chance meeting in the airport in Omaha, and we began to discuss these things, too, that were on his mind, that brought about the bill that is now H.R. 184. That is the Winnebago Land Transfer Act.

In 1865, the United States Government and the Winnebago Tribe signed a treaty that granted that land on both sides of the Missouri River to the Winnebago Tribe. As the river changed and situations changed—actually, I shouldn't say both sides of the river. It was the Nebraska side of the river. When the river changed, that meant that a lot of that land actually ended up in Iowa.

The Corps of Engineers came in 105 years later and condemned that property for their own project. It was a takings, and I believe it was an unconstitutional takings. In doing so, they never compensated them for that land, and they didn't use that land for the project for which they had intended.

So, over time, the Winnebagos were able to put the money together to go to court. The statute of limitations had expired. The court ruled that, if they were going to rule on the issue, they would grant the land back to the Winnebagos, but it was beyond their jurisdiction because of the statute of limitations.

The only thing that puts that land back is an act of Congress, and that is the Winnebago Land Transfer Act, H.R. 184. If we can conclude that this week or next week, it will be the time that we have finished the biggest part of the work of Frank LaMere. We should do so to honor his life.

One of the things that he was quoted as saying, and this was at the services for him: ''If you haven't been marginalized at least once a week, then you probably haven't done very much.''

I can identify with that, Madam Speaker, and I can identify with the life of selfless work of Frank LaMere.

We honor his life. Let's honor his life in this Congress this week or next.

STOPPING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today for Hadiya Pendleton, taken by gun violence on January 23, 2013. She was 15.

I rise for Terrell Bosley, taken by gun violence on April 4, 2006. He was 18 and unloading musical instruments from a car.

I rise for Blair Holt, taken by gun violence on May 7, 2007. He was 16 and died shielding others from bullets.

Today I rise for Gregory Shondale, killed yesterday. He was 41.

Madam Speaker, I rise for them and for all those taken from us by senseless gun violence that continues unchecked in our Nation because of inaction on the part of the Senate Majority Leader and the President.

I rise today more than 100 days after this House, the people's House, sent bipartisan universal background check legislation, H.R. 8, to the Senate, which has failed to consider any legislation for more than 8 weeks.

I rise today for the 100 Americans who will lose their lives to gun violence today and Americans who will be shot, survive, and face a lifetime of recovery. That will be 210 Americans.

I rise because someone must—someone must—stand up to speak for those who have had their voices silenced by gun violence. Someone must speak for the mom of five who suffered domestic violence, found the courage to leave her abusive relationship, and ended up dead because her abuser had easy access to a gun.

Someone must speak up for the little girl playing in the park who was gunned down because guns are more common than schools in her neighborhood.

Someone must speak for the veteran and the farmer who face what seem like insurmountable odds with no way out, who tragically end their own life.

Someone must speak for those killed at Pulse and at supermarkets because of who they are and whom they love.

Someone must speak for the person, often a young Black man, who will be gunned down by a cop who shot first and asked questions later.

Someone must speak for the first responders who are taking their own

lives at alarming rates. Someone must speak for them.

Someone must tell the story of everyday gun violence that plagues our communities from Chicago to Key West.

Too often, this House focuses on the mass shooting tragedies in this Nation that have become more and more common since our Republican colleagues allowed the assault weapons ban to expire in 2004. We hold moments of silence. My colleagues run to their tweets with their thoughts and prayers to justify their continued and negligent inaction. But we forget gun violence happens every day in every community.

We cannot forget about those who died alone from gun violence in city parks, in road rage incidents, and in their own homes, entrapped by depression and despair. They, too, deserve to be remembered. Their lives and stories should also challenge us to actions so we can say ''not one more'' and then actually do something to prevent another death, another funeral, and another life forever altered.

Madam Speaker, I am proud that this House finally acted. After the American people sent a historic wave of new Members to Congress, Members who understand that commonsense gun safety reform saves lives, we voted to enact bipartisan universal background check legislation that is supported by more than 90 percent of Americans and 70 percent of NRA members.

We also voted to close the Charleston loophole, a clear gap in our laws that allowed a known white supremacist to legally purchase a weapon and use it to steal the lives of nine people seeking to better know their God.

We know this is a problem. We passed legislation to close this loophole, and yet the Senate, controlled by Republicans, have still done nothing. My good colleagues in the Senate continue to do nothing while people die every day in every State and in every community. Still they do nothing. They refuse to act. Still they offer hollow thoughts and prayers while rushing to the bank with pockets full of NRA donations.

□ 0945

Perhaps that is the problem, Madam Speaker. Perhaps it is the money.

The American people should know that the President got $30 million from the NRA in his 2016 campaign. What are they buying?

The American people deserve to know that the Senate majority leader has taken more than $1 million from the NRA over his career. What were they investing in?

The American people deserve to know that too many in the GOP are bought and sold by the NRA or too often afraid of them to grow a spine and stand up for their constituents.

It is a sad fact that just 8—that is right, just 8—of 198 Members, or a mere 4 percent of the House Republican Conference, had the courage to stand with gun violence victims and 90 percent of Americans. I thank those courageous eight Republicans for voting to save lives.

Madam Speaker, to my colleagues still too afraid or too owned by the NRA to act, I say good luck next year. They had their chance, and they failed miserably. They are on the wrong side of history.

Next year, the American people will not forget.

RECOGNIZING THOMAS J. HAAS

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of a friend, public servant, and caring educator: Grand Valley State University President Thomas J. Haas.

As a retired U.S. Coast Guard captain who also holds a Ph.D., President Haas has devoted his life of service to our country and, most recently, to west Michigan and the students of Grand Valley State University.

Having been appointed the university's fourth president in 2006, he successfully laid a foundation for a culture that nurtures innovation and excellence. Under his leadership, enrollment has soared to over 25,000 students, while 46 undergraduate and graduate programs have also been added and the university expanded with 2.5 million square feet of new buildings.

''T. Haas,'' as he is affectionately called by students, and his wife, Marcia, will forever be cherished and adored by the Grand Valley community. Together, they have passionately dedicated themselves to putting students first.

The now-famous selfie with T. Haas, as it is known, it is a clear example of the way they treated every student like their own.

President Haas is the epitome of the phrase ''Laker for a Lifetime.'' It has been an honor to work with him in support of Grand Valley, its students, and all of west Michigan.

While his time as president may be coming to an end, his legacy and impact will forever live on.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

RECOGNIZING LUIS ALVAREZ

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lou Alvarez, an incredible patriot, Long Islander, and 9/11 first responder who inspired so many just last week in front of the House Judiciary Committee in support of the Never Forget the Heroes Act, which will reauthorize and fully fund the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund.

After his appearance in D.C., Lou rushed home for his 69th round of chemo. Let me repeat that: After coming all the way down to Washington to beg for the benefits that he and so many others were promised, Lou Alvarez had to rush home for his 69th round of chemo.

Unfortunately, when he got home, things did not go as expected. This morning, I am sad to report, Lou is in hospice, watching us here on the House floor.

Lou is one of the many first responders who raced to Ground Zero on September 11 without a second thought, who, in the weeks following, worked 12-hour shifts on the pile, aiding in the rescue and cleanup efforts.

Lou, like so many of his fellow first responders, was diagnosed with one of the thousands of cancers attributed to the inhalation of toxic air and debris at Ground Zero.

We have lost more 9/11 first responders since 9/11 than we lost people on 9/11 itself. We must fully fund and reauthorize the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund.

Last Tuesday, like so many times before, Lou once again made the trip to Washington to testify in front of the committee, begging Congress to fully fund the compensation fund.

It wasn't his first time to D.C., not by a long shot. It wasn't his second or third time. Unfortunately, it may have been his last.

The wait has been a disgrace to these first responders, to their families, and to our Nation.

This isn't just a New York issue, and I thank BILL HUIZENGA for staying around for Lou. This isn't a Democratic or Republican Party platform or a political football.

This is a responsibility that we all shoulder as Americans, first and foremost. This is the spirit of our country. It is who we are as a people.

Last Wednesday, following Lou's testimony, the Never Forget the Heroes Act passed committee unanimously. This floor and the Senate need to pass it to make this bill law right away.

I would like to sign off today the way Lou signs off nearly everything he writes, the way he lives his life each and every day, until his very last. Lou Alvarez says, ''Still here, still breathing, still fighting.''

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HECK) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

Very Reverend Canon Martini Shaw, Historic African Episcopal Church of St. Thomas, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, we pause this morning to express our gratitude.

We especially give thanks and pray for our Nation.

Praying for unity where there is division.

Praying for peace where there is discord.

Praying for love where there is hatred.

Praying for the eradication of all forms of racism, sexism, ageism, inequality, and poverty.

Praying for an end to xenophobia, homophobia, and all other phobias that might plague and poison our Nation.

Praying that we may continue to strive for justice and peace for all people, and always respect the dignity of every human being.

O Lord, bless these United States; for united we stand and divided we fall.

Unite us that we may be more loving and compassionate; more understanding and giving; more inviting and welcoming.

Bless all elected officials, the communities they serve, and every State, every Commonwealth, every city, every district, on every street, and on every doorstep.

And now, O Lord, bless the business proceedings of this day.

O Lord, hear our prayer.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GIANFORTE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING VERY REVEREND CANON MARTINI SHAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to welcome today's guest chaplain, who is from my district. Father Shaw is the rector of the historic African Episcopal Church of St. Thomas in Philadelphia. The church was founded in 1729 as the first black church in the Episcopal Church in the United States. It is also the oldest African American church in Philadelphia.

I have known Father Shaw for many, many years. More recently, I had the pleasure of working closely with him in the Together for West Philadelphia initiative, which recently celebrated its first year of working to improve health and reduce poverty for the residents of West Philadelphia. That is just one example from his long record of working for social justice.

I know Father Shaw has previously lived in Detroit and Chicago, but I am glad that he has chosen to live where America began, in the City of Brotherly Love and Sisterly Affection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of World Refugee Day and in support of the community of refugees who have resettled in my district.

One of these refugees is Kifah Abdulla, who lived in Baghdad until war broke out at home. He spent over 8 years as a prisoner of war. He was isolated because of his activism against the dictatorship.

He was a refugee for 11 years in Amman, Jordan, and 5 years in the Netherlands, before coming to Portland, Maine in 2011. He is now an Arabic teacher, a published poet, a performer, and an activist.

There is a reason America has signed international treaties and passed laws giving shelter to those fleeing persecution. Many refugees, like Mr. Abdulla, were jailed or tortured because they protested, organized, or challenged their government. These values are at the core of our Nation.

Every year, refugees travel 1.2 billion miles in search of safety. And right now, we are in the midst of the greatest refugee crisis since World War II. Sadly, when people fleeing the violence need us most, the administration has dramatically reduced refugee admissions.

In a Nation where nearly all of us have come ''from away,'' as we say in Maine, I urge us all to make our communities warm, safe, and welcoming to refugees across the globe.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT CLIFFORD CHESTER SIMS

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Staff Sergeant Clifford Chester Sims. Sergeant Sims made the ultimate sacrifice for our country during the Vietnam war.

Sergeant Sims was born in Port St. Joe, Florida, and orphaned at a young age. He was adopted at age 13 by James and Irene Sims. He met his wife, Mary, and joined the Army after high school.

On February 21, 1968, while behind enemy lines during the Battle of Hue in the Republic of Vietnam, Sims threw himself on a grenade in defense of his squad. Sergeant Sims made the ultimate sacrifice to protect his comrades in arms, all while fighting in the name of liberty.

Sergeant Sims was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor for his heroic actions. This week, Bay County officially named June 18 Staff Sergeant Clifford Chester Sims Day.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Sergeant Clifford Sims and all our fallen heroes who gave that last full measure of devotion to our Nation.

REMEMBERING THE NAMES AND LIVES OF THE VICTIMS OF ORLANDO'S PULSE NIGHTCLUB SHOOTING

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, 49 innocent souls were gunned down at Orlando's Pulse nightclub. In my brief moment here with you, I lift up their first names and their lives.

Edward, Stanley, Ramon, Christopher, Eric, Peter, Luis, Amanda, Jason, Cory, Shane, Kimberly, Eddie, Darryl, Deonka, Anthony, Jean, Luis, Oscar, Enrique, Javier, Jerald, Luis, Tevin, Alejandro, Franky, Martin, Mercedes, Xavier, Gilberto, Simon, Miguel, Joel, Juan, Luis, Juan, Jonathan, Jean, Rodolfo, Brenda, Yilmary, Angel, Frank, Paul, Leroy, Antonio, Christopher, Akyra, and Geraldo.

To Senator MCCONNELL and the other leaders, take up legislation that will save lives.

RECOGNIZING POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the need to ensure quality healthcare for our veterans and military members who may be suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder.

According to the Military Health System, 14 percent of servicemembers who served in Iraq or Afghanistan suffer from PTSD. The condition can lead to substance abuse and cause serious physical and mental health problems.

In Montana, 1 in 10 residents are veterans. That is one reason I have acted to expand mental health services in Montana. With increased resources for the VA system, improved access to community healthcare, and the expansion of telemedicine, we can help to ensure that those who have served get

the treatment they need, regardless of where they live.

June is Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Month. I encourage my colleagues to support our veterans and military members who suffer from PTSD. We must keep our commitments to them and provide the highest quality of care.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION AMENDMENT

(Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank my colleagues for unanimously passing my bipartisan amendment yesterday to increase funding by $3 million to the Northern Border Regional Commission.

The NBRC is a critical, rural economic development agency that has created jobs in my district and supported so many meaningful projects around New Hampshire.

From 2010–2017, the NBRC invested over $7 million into the Granite State communities and, more importantly, leveraged nearly $31 million in matching funds.

This is a smart and strategic use of tax dollars, and I am so pleased that the House passed my bipartisan amendment with Congressman CHRIS PAPPAS, Congresswoman ELISE STEFANIK, and Congressman PETER WELCH, to increase funding to the historic level of $25 million in the next fiscal year.

As a conferee on the 2018 farm bill conference committee, I was pleased to lead the effort to add Cheshire and Belknap Counties, and I am delighted to add $3 million.

ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, June is Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month, and I rise today to share with this Chamber the impact that Alzheimer's disease has had on this country and my family.

Today, 5.8 million Americans live with brain disease. I have witnessed firsthand the burdens of these illnesses because my father, Andrew Katko, lived with Alzheimer's for nearly a decade before succumbing to the disease a few months ago.

My family was faced with the difficult decision on how to care for our father during this time in his life. This is not uncommon among families across our great Nation.

Often, family and friends are primary caretakers for those suffering with Alzheimer's and dementia. My mother, Mary Lou, served as my father's primary caregiver, joining 16 million Americans who provide unpaid care. This year, unpaid caregivers will provide 18.5 billion hours of care valued at $234 billion.

The BOLD Infrastructure for Alzheimer's Act was signed into law last Congress proudly and is now being implemented. This legislation authorizes the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to research prevention methods for dementias and establish local treatment facilities.

I am committed to passing additional policies that improve the lives of those living with dementias.

ACCESS TO BROADBAND

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

Mr. DELGADO. Mr. Speaker, as we work through this year's appropriations package, I want to thank my colleagues for passing my amendment to fix our broken broadband mapping system.

Access to broadband is a timely and urgent need in my district, and if we don't address how we map and evaluate who has high-speed Internet, small business owners, students, and farmers will be left behind.

The FCC's recent Broadband Deployment Report states that more than 21 million Americans lack access to high-speed internet, but everyone in this body and back home knows there are many more out there.

The issue is that we evaluate broadband coverage based on census-block mapping. In other words, if one house on one block can purchase coverage, the whole block is deemed ''served.''

We will never close the digital divide relying on bad data. My amendment prevents the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relying solely on census-block data for broadband availability maps.

Bad data yields bad maps, and this critical amendment will put an end to it. I thank my colleagues for joining me in support of this crucial amendment.

□ 1015

HONORING DAVIE COUNTY FIREFIGHTERS

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to recognize and honor firefighters from my district in Davie County, North Carolina, who battled an early morning fire caused by a lightning strike earlier this week. Thanks to their efforts and heroism, Mr. Speaker, a church building was spared.

Around 3:30 a.m. this Tuesday, Davie County firefighters responded to a fire at Smith Grove United Methodist Church along U.S. Highway 158 in Mocksville. When the firefighters arrived on the scene, flames were bursting out of the roof and immediate action was needed to stop the flames, according to Smith Grove Fire Chief Don Howard.

Even though the lightning strike caused the steeple to fall off the roof of the church, the firefighters pressed on to fight the flames and save the majority of the building.

I am grateful for the service of these men and women, many of whom are volunteers, who every day put themselves in danger to keep our families and our communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to recognize the departments that responded, which included Smith Grove, Farmington, Cornatzer-Dulin, Mocksville, the Cooleemee Fire Departments; Davie EMS; Davie County Fire Marshal's Office; and the Davie County Sheriff's Office.

I thank these heroes and others like them in our country.

NATIONAL GUARD AMENDMENT WILL IMPROVE READINESS

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my amendment to H.R. 2740, the Defense appropriations bill.

With the cosponsorship of my fellow Kentuckian, Congressman GUTHRIE, my amendment increases Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard operations and maintenance by $2 million each for training support. This funding will support the training of National Guard and Reserve components by the Army in order to improve readiness.

General Lengyel of the National Guard Bureau, earlier this year before the Appropriations Committee, said: ''There is only one standard of readiness in fighting America's wars. This readiness requires the National Guard to be deployable, sustainable, and interoperable with our Active components.''

As the representative for Kentucky's National Guard headquarters, it is essential we support training and coordination between the components of our Armed Forces.

I was proud to advocate for this important increased funding, which will allow Active-Duty Army personnel to more frequently advise, assist, and train with Guard and Reserve units on drill weekends to ensure both are meeting the same level of readiness.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for adopting this amendment.

CELEBRATING AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

(Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to once again rise

to join in commemorating June 20, 2019, as American Eagle Day and to celebrate the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

On June 20, 1782, the eagle was designated as the national emblem of the United States by the Founding Fathers at the Second Continental Congress.

The bald eagle is the central image of the Great Seal of the United States and is displayed in the official seal of many branches and departments of the Federal Government.

The bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the spirit of freedom and democracy of the United States. Since the founding of the Nation, the image, meaning, and symbolism of the eagle has played a significant role in art, music, history, commerce, literature, architecture, and culture of the United States. The bald eagle's habitat only exists in North America.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in celebrating June 20, 2019, as American Eagle Day, which marks the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain this request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill so the American people know where we stand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEAN). Pursuant to House Resolution 445 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3055.

Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) kindly take the chair.

□ 1019

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, with Mr. HECK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 19, 2019, amendment No. 58 printed in part B of House Report 116–119 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) had been disposed of.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of Chairwoman LOWEY, and I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Chair, this is Maleah Davis. We mourn her loss in Houston, Texas. She was 4 years old.

My amendment provides funding to support and engage adult men and young persons to reduce and prevent domestic violence against children. In recent reports, 1,600 children died because of abuse or neglect.

This amendment will help ensure the safety of vulnerable children in at-risk households who are powerless to get the help and attention they need from our government.

To illustrate this, this is the case of Maleah Davis, a 4-year-old girl who lived in Houston. In the past, Texas Child Protective Services removed Maleah and her two brothers from their home over reports of abuse but returned them again in February. They took them away from their relatives and, along with a court judge, returned them to this family.

Maleah's mother dated her boyfriend for years, and they had a son. Maleah's mother had gone to a funeral out of town.

When the boyfriend initially reported that his girlfriend's daughter was missing, he told detectives that he had been attacked, but surveillance video shows him carrying a black bag out of the home.

The last time that Maleah was seen was going into that home.

The real question is whether or not the Child Protective Services is really doing its job, whether or not it is dealing with educating these families or intervening in these families to make sure a loving little girl like Maleah Davis does not lose her life.

In addition to this funding to intervene in men and boys' lives to prevent this kind of abuse and loss of life, and the tragedy of finding the remains of little Maleah in a plastic bag along the highway in Arkansas, I look forward to working with my colleagues on an overhaul of children's protective services throughout the Nation, because, in particular in Texas, 1,600 children die of abuse and neglect, many of them in children's protective services.

I am delighted that my amendment passed.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Chairwoman LOWEY's En Bloc Amendment No. 2, which includes Jackson Lee Amendment No. 19.

I wish to thank Chairman MCGOVERN and Ranking Member COLE of the Rules Committee for making this Jackson Lee Amendment in order.

I thank Chairman SERRANO and Ranking Member ADERHOLD for their hard work in bringing Division A, the Commerce-Justice-Science portion of this omnibus appropriations legislative package, to the floor.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple and straightforward and ensures that our government works to protect our children.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 19, reprograms $2 million in the Office of Justice Programs grant funding to support programs to engage adult men and young persons to reduce and prevent domestic violence against children.

This amendment will help ensure the safety of vulnerable children in at-risk households, who are powerless to getting the help and attention they need from our government.

To illustrate the need for this amendment, let me share with you the tragic case of Maleah Davis, a 4–year old little girl who lived in Houston.

In the past, Texas Child Protective Services removed Maleah and her two brothers from their home over reports of abuse, but returned them to the home in February.

Maleah's mother dated her boyfriend for years and they shared a toddler son together.

Maleah's mother had gone out of town when she left her daughter under her boyfriend's care.

When the boyfriend initially reported that his girlfriend's daughter was missing, he told detectives he had been attacked by unknown men a day earlier and that they kidnapped Maleah.

However, surveillance video outside of the home shows Maleah never left their apartment after she followed him in, and shows him carrying a laundry basket with a trash bag out of the building a day before he reported her missing.

Maleah's remains were later discovered in a bag along Interstate 30 in Arkansas.

Although the case has not been completed yet, there are valuable lessons that we can learn from Maleah's and similar cases.

There have been similar cases to Maleah where the caretaker initially reports a missing child but we later learn that the caretaker is actually the suspect and perpetrator of the crime.

Similar cases include 5–year old AJ Freund from Illinois, whose father confessed to hiding his body in the basement, and 7-week old Shaylie Madden from North Carolina, whose mother has been charged with first-degree attempted murder.

The nation has learned from Maleah and other similar stories that we must do everything in our power to protect at risk children.

Maleah Davis should be alive today.

Horrible cases such as this should not be happening in America; we need to make sure our checks and balances are keeping our children safe.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for supporting en bloc No. 2, which included two of my amendments.

The first amendment directs NASA to work toward the development of a low-enriched uranium space power reactor. NASA has been developing a low-enriched uranium propulsion system, but some of the funding for this has been used on other projects, including a power reactor using weapons-grade uranium.

The problem is that if all the spacefaring nations of the world start using large amounts of weapons-grade material in their space reactors, then it will be difficult to ensure that this material would not be diverted to weapons programs in space and on Earth.

If the U.S. develops a low-enriched uranium space power reactor design, it is likely that this type of reactor design will be adopted as a de facto standard by other spacefaring nations, making Earth and space a safer place.

The second amendment directs $6.5 million of the space technology account, which is currently funded at $1.29 billion, to be used by the NASA Innovative Advanced Concepts, or NIAC, program. That will put the total budget for NIAC at $15.2 million.

The NIAC program nurtures visionary ideas that could transform future NASA missions with the creation of breakthroughs that could dramatically lower the cost of space travel while simultaneously engaging America's innovators and entrepreneurs as partners in the journey.

The nation that first demonstrates such technologies will own the future of space travel.

At $15.2 million, NIAC is still less than a tenth of a percent of NASA's overall $22 billion budget, but this is a small step in the right direction.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for their support of these amendments.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. CROW

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 65 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Bureau of the Census to use information or records received through data sharing agreements in contravention of existing law, including sections 9 and 214 of title 13, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that would defend the integrity of the U.S. Census.

The U.S. Census is crucial to every community, and it is our duty as Members of Congress to ensure that every person is counted. Not only does the Census send a message that every person should be counted, but it determines how and where Federal dollars are spent.

Simply put, it is crucial for our local cities and counties.

The Census count helps us understand how to best provide healthcare, education, housing, and numerous other public services.

As the chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee on Innovation and Workforce Development, I have seen how the Census determines how we spend Federal dollars for programs like the Small Business Development Center Program and Community Development Block Grants.

It is clear that the purpose of the citizenship question, which we have already debated and will continue to debate, is not to ensure that resources go to the communities that need it most but rather to stoke fear and suppress the Census count.

In communities like mine, this would have a huge impact. It would undermine our ability to gather an accurate count. That doesn't just hurt people in our community. It strains public resources and poses risks to our community's public health and safety.

I am here to lift up the voices in my community and assure them that Congress will not replace good governance with fear.

While the administration announced that it would continue the data-sharing agreement with the Department of Homeland Security to provide quality statistics, my amendment reasserts that existing law prohibits the Census Bureau from sharing individualized Census data across agencies. Congress must stand firm in assuring the public that no disaggregated data may leave the Census.

Furthermore, this amendment raises awareness of the law that penalizes any disclosure of information by Census employees who share personally identifiable information with agencies like Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Customs and Border Protection.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, I thank Congressman CROW for yielding and for his great work on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, the Census aims to count each person living in the United States every 10 years. It is important that we get this count right because the information helps determine a vast array of decisions, from the number of congressional seats to the allocation of Federal dollars.

For example, according to the Brennan Center for Justice, my home State of Texas stands to gain three congressional seats. These gains will go a long way for Texans and help bring much-needed funds to every community in the State, but we must ensure an accurate count.

With the administration's push to include a citizenship question on the upcoming Census and scare Latino communities like mine into not participating, this amendment underscores the fact that no personally identifiable information can be shared.

This amendment will give all residents, regardless of their immigration status, the confidence they need to answer the survey questions freely and to know that their data will be kept safe and secure.

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

□ 1030

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment and actually thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment to the floor.

As I had said yesterday, I certainly understand the concerns and the potential misuse of Census data, but by law the Census Bureau cannot and it will not disclose anyone's response or share data from which an individual can be identified with ICE or any other agency.

Thankfully the law is already on the books. Census data sharing is a felony punishable by up to 5 years in prison and a $250,000 fine. Census data is important, and it is confidential.

Fortunately, the Census Bureau is deploying expert communicators and trusted messengers all across the United States to work in each community to motivate each and every person to respond to the Census, and it would also help to spread the word that a person's response that they are not a citizen of the United States does not provide the government with really any reliable information about whether they are lawfully present in the U.S.

So, even if this information was sent to ICE, it would really have no use. It would be of no use to them. A successful 2020 Census will provide a full, accurate, secure account of every person living in the U.S. while gathering the data vital to both understanding our Nation's changing demographics and bolstering the enforcement of the Voting Rights Act.

Therefore, I join my colleagues in opposing any funds that would be made available to violate the confidentiality laws governing our Census, and I thank the gentleman for raising this issue

and certainly support a ''yes'' vote on this important amendment.

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

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chair, just to be clear, we vehemently oppose the citizenship question because as the evidence has made it abundantly clear, the purpose of that question is to suppress the count and to stoke fears within our communities, which will have a huge detrimental impact to our ability to gain an accurate count and provide resources in an effective way and to govern throughout the country.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of this amendment.

The Commerce Department has not answered basic questions related to the purpose behind its sharing agreement with the Department of Homeland Security.

Although I am not suggesting the Census Bureau will use the information for something other than statistical purposes, I think it is important to remind the Department we are mindful of how individuals' information will be handled.

Ensuring the public trust in the Census is vital to getting an accurate count, and this amendment helps in that goal.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chair, in closing, I just want to reiterate the need that we send a very strong message as Members of Congress that we have to enforce existing law.

We have to provide the confidence to people throughout the country that the Census will not be used to undermine the integrity of the process, that the citizenship question's purpose is to stoke fears and to suppress the count, and that we will not allow those fears to overcome the need for good governance to gain an accurate count and make sure that the government is working effectively and we are providing resources to people throughout our communities.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MS. DEAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 66 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 49, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, public service is a high calling, and we should do everything we can to encourage our best and our brightest, really all, to pursue it. For me, the opportunity to serve in Congress is a privilege and the honor of a lifetime, and I know my fellow Members feel the same.

Unfortunately, for too many young people, public service isn't always a realistic option. Nowhere is that surer than our broken criminal justice system. There is no question that if we are going to fix the problems that trouble our criminal justice system, we need prosecutors and public defenders of the highest caliber.

Right now, students graduate law school with between $84,000 and $122,000 in debt, while jobs in prosecutor's or defender's offices pay just $56- to $58,000 a year. As a result, students who are eager to contribute their talents to work for justice to defend the rights of the vulnerable simply can't afford to. Well, we can't afford to lose them.

The John R. Justice Act was designed to fix this problem by providing student loan repayment of $10,000 a year for law students who make a minimum 3-year commitment to public service. In theory, students can earn up to $60,000 in total loan repayments, making public service a far more realistic option.

In reality, however, Congress has failed to properly fund the program. While the program is authorized up to $25 million a year, actual appropriations have fallen dramatically short and now sit at just under $2 million.

Here are the consequences: In my home State of Pennsylvania, the Commission on Crime and Delinquency was able to fund only 38 of the 167 applicants received since 2015. That is less than 25 percent. For those individuals who were fortunate enough to receive any funding at all, the grant amounts totaled only $4,100.

That is better than nothing, but for most students it is not enough to help them pay down their debt and devote themselves to public service.

It is time to act. This amendment doubles the funds provided under the John R. Justice Act, thereby delivering an immediate, substantial impact. This will mean concrete help for many more students who are eager to work on behalf of the public and build a better, smarter, more compassionate criminal justice system.

It also sends a signal that we in Congress aren't satisfied with mere rhetoric and that we will do what it takes to give every student a chance to serve their communities and their country.

Mr. Chair, in closing, I am very pleased to put this forward in hopes that we draw more talent not just in my home State but across this country to public service in prosecutor's and public defender's offices around the Nation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the ''Memorandum for Federal Prosecutors Along the Southwest Border, Zero-tolerance for Offenses Under 8 U.S.C. 1325(a)'' issued by the Attorney General on April 6, 2018.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On April 6, 2018, then-Attorney General Jeff Sessions unveiled the zero-tolerance prosecution policy, a memo directing U.S. Attorneys along the southwest border to prosecute all improper entry cases impacting thousands of migrants since its implementation.

My amendment would end this policy and restore prosecutorial discretion at the Department of Justice. This amendment is necessary because zero-tolerance is the center of the administration's cruel family separation policy.

Under zero-tolerance, when an asylum-seeking family crosses the border between a port of entry, parents are placed in DOJ custody while they await their prosecution date. The child is then deemed unaccompanied and placed in the custody of the Office of Refugee Resettlement. At least 3,000 families that we know of have been separated. Some children were literally ripped from their parents' arms.

At the height of the family separation crisis last summer, the President signed an executive order entitled: ''Affording Congress an Opportunity to Address Family Separation.'' That was on June 20, 2018, exactly 1 year ago today. However, this executive order does not end zero-tolerance. Instead, the executive order favored family detention—possibly indefinitely—over release.

I have seen the consequences of family separation firsthand in my community. Before zero-tolerance was implemented, the administration used El Paso as a testing ground for these horrific family separations in the fall of 2017. During this pilot program, 281 families were separated. The American Association of Pediatrics tells us that separating children from their parents

is highly damaging and can cause long-term health consequences from toxic stress.

These children are suffering emotionally and physically as a result of this government. We must put an end to this cruelty and work on reuniting all of those who remain separated.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, a vote for this amendment is a vote to effectively decriminalize the action of crossing the border unlawfully.

The passage of this amendment would directly undermine the sovereignty of the United States, and furthermore, if passed, the amendment would immediately be seized upon by every criminal human smuggling organization and used as a selling point to convince migrants to come to the United States in an unlawful manner.

It would trigger a flood of illegal immigration unlike anything we have ever seen, which will cause most of the most vulnerable individuals to attempt to embark on a dangerous journey. Cartels and human smuggling organizations will profit. Our borders will be less secure. And the American people will pay the cost of open borders for years to come.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in very strong support of the gentlewoman's amendment.

The zero-tolerance experiment has been a tragic mistake. It has swamped U.S. Attorneys, U.S. Marshals, and district courts with low level nonviolent cases previously handled by DHS and, if necessary, immigration courts. It has also separated thousands of families and traumatized children and parents. Children may remain with parents in DHS custody, but they cannot follow them into jail, even for such misdemeanor charges.

DOJ should focus on criminal gangs, human trafficking, and smuggling, most of which passes through, not between, the ports of entry.

The zero-tolerance policy restricts seasoned prosecutors from pursuing serious crime and distorts priorities by requiring an unbalanced and inflexible approach. It is clearly not improving things at the border.

Mr. Chair, I urge the House to adopt this very important amendment.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers. I would just urge all of my colleagues to come to my community to see for themselves the impact of this horrific policy.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1045

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. GOLDEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to utilize a right whale status and risk reduction decision support tool.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise to offer my amendment to H.R. 3055.

Mr. Chair, it is frequently said that working men and women feel left out by their government's decisionmaking process. Too often in Washington, those with the greatest financial means can get the closest to the political, governmental, and regulatory process and, therefore, be better able to influence it.

Just as bad is that, in this gridlock political machine, what little action that does take place often takes the path of least resistance.

So when a species of whale is at risk of extinction for a whole slew of complex reasons—whether it be the overfishing that took place more than a century ago, climate change and warming waters that wreak havoc upon a whale's habitat, seismic air gun testing for oil and natural gas, deadly ship strikes by a large shipping industry, or the risk of entanglement in a lobsterman's fishing gear—who, and to what degree, does Washington regulate each? And who has a seat at the table to ensure that the process behind such decisions is fair and equitable?

Do we believe that a small group of fishermen in Maine have as strong a place at the table as does the fossil fuel or shipping industry, or the governmental affairs director with a K Street office in Washington?

I don't think so.

So NOAA, facing the threat of lawsuits, has rushed ahead using a decision support tool that was developed for the purpose of reducing ship strikes by the Navy and fed that tool with old data and hasty assumptions and have come forward to require Maine lobstermen to achieve a 60 percent risk reduction in their fishery.

What assumptions you might ask?

Maine's own Department of Marine Resources argues the tool is flawed because areas with a lot of fishing gear but few whales are labeled ''high risk,'' and areas with a lot of whales and less fishing gear are considered ''low risk.''

This scientific tool uses outdated habitat data from the mid-Atlantic, which is far away and different than the gulf of Maine. When attributing responsibility for injury or death of whale to fishing gear of an unknown origin, NOAA assumes an equal distribution between U.S. and Canadian gear, despite strong, recent scientific and empirical evidence to the contrary. And the data used do not accurately reflect the distribution shift of right whales since the year 2010.

Recent studies have established firm links between warming waters in the gulf of Maine and a 90 percent reduction of the plankton that right whales eat, calling into question whether the whales have stopped visiting the warming, plankton-depleted waters of eastern Maine entirely, which would greatly reduce the likelihood that any whale be entangled in Maine lobstermen's gear.

It is reasonable to ask NOAA to allow its decision support tool to undergo a peer-review process before enforcing punitive regulations upon Maine fisherman. Maine's Commissioner of the Department of Marine Resources has said that ''peer-reviewed science is the cornerstone of the decisionmaking process.'' Apparently, not in this case.

This amendment would require NOAA to use relevant data and an effective tool to ensure that its regulations target areas of high risk and yield the most effective conservation benefits possible to protect the right whale without unfairly burdening Maine lobstermen.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit NOAA from utilizing a science-based stakeholder decision support tool to save the North Atlantic right whale from imminent extinction.

The decision support tool was developed based on the best-available scientific information and models about the population dynamics of the whales. Defunding it undermines the consensus-based conservation decisionmaking process under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and would set a dangerous precedent for implementation of that law. It would also have lasting impacts for other species, fisheries, and industries.

Again, this whale, the North Atlantic right whale, is critically endangered. There are less than 420 left. That is fewer than we have Members of this House of Representatives.

With this amendment, while it may be well-intended to protect Maine lobstermen, it could have broadly undermining effects on right whale conservation and on NOAA's responsibilities under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act.

I fully understand my colleague's concerns and efforts to support constituencies. I, too, represent a coastal district with commercial fishermen; so does our colleague, SETH MOULTON in Massachusetts. And we are committed to working together to find a solution to the crisis facing the North Atlantic right whale, including holding a hearing on Mr. MOULTON's bill, the bipartisan SAVE Right Whales Act, in the Water, Oceans, and Wildlife Subcommittee that I chair.

I am also fully supportive of his amendment to increase funding for right whale conservation. We should be devoting more resources to develop innovative solutions for the recovery of right whales to meet both fisheries and conservation goals, not choosing one goal over the other which, unfortunately, this amendment does.

I would also point out that the Committee on Natural Resources worked with Mr. GOLDEN on several other possible amendments. We continue to stand ready to work on other ways and other solutions, but unfortunately, this amendment is not it.

Mr. Chair, I urge opposition, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chair, I just want to point out that the person who runs this program for NOAA has actually recently said that they intend to move forward with regulations, then do a peer review, and then, perhaps, come back with a different conclusion.

I think that they have got this backwards. They should be doing it the other way around, and that is what is at the heart of this amendment. I would urge support at this time for the amendment, as well as for the Moulton amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), and I thank her for joining me on this amendment and for her leadership on behalf of Maine fisheries.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding me time, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for raising concerns that I think many of us have. But in this case, I am supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I have long fought to protect the health of our oceans and the sea life that inhabit them. That is why I have opposed the Trump administration's plan to drill in the gulf of Maine since day one. And I am proud that this Chamber recently passed our ocean acidification bill.

Along with my colleague from Maine's Second District, we represent 90 percent of all the lobster landings in the United States. Lobster is an iconic symbol of our State, especially this time of year when Mainers and visitors from across the country enjoy our coastline and our food.

I am proud of our very well-managed and highly restrictive lobster fishery of responsible operators. We need to work together on a new peer-reviewed tool to address this problem.

Our State also is the home of a vibrant conservation movement that supports marine conservation and protecting the right whale. We have been successful over the past several years in creating tools with NOAA, our lobster industry, and conservationists. Indeed, the State of Maine has been actively involved in right whale conservation and worked with NOAA in the past to ensure that our State is doing all we can to keep whales safe in our very active fisheries.

Unfortunately, in April, NOAA's Large Whale Take Reduction Team announced a plan to reduce right whale deaths that forced lobstermen to reduce their vertical lines by 50 percent. This risk-reduction tool, as my colleague mentioned, has not gone through a peer-review process despite significant concerns from the stakeholders that should be addressed. It does not account for many of the issues specific to the gulf of Maine.

Mr. Chair, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to stand for a fair process, and I support this amendment.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I recognize what my friends from Maine are attempting to do to help an important industry in their State, but I must oppose them in favor of supporting the critically endangered Atlantic right whale.

The decision support tool that this amendment would block is used by States to determine how they can ensure they are taking steps to protect these whales. Preventing its use would, therefore, remove the ability of the States to make their own determination.

Consequently, NOAA would be forced to set a national standard. Additionally, given the way it is drafted, this amendment would block NOAA's conservation work on right whales, not just in the Atlantic, but also in the Pacific.

Other agencies that rely on this tool include the Coast Guard and Navy, who rely on it to ensure that they are in compliance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

As I said earlier, I understand my friend's concern, and I would support funding to help develop new and more whale-friendly fishing gear and other mitigation options. I cannot, however, support an amendment that removes a scientific tool to make informed natural resource management decisions. It would only further endanger these majestic animals.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the tool that we are talking about was developed by a consensus-based take reduction team that included the consensus support of all representatives of the fishing industry who sat on that team, the entire Maine delegation, that the team unanimously supported the decision.

Mr. Chair, an end-run around that congressionally mandated process at this critical moment, taking away the lifeline that the North Atlantic right whale needs as it teeters on the brink of extinction, is the wrong way to protect Maine lobstermen. We can work together on other threats, other ways to help the lobstermen.

We need to start that conversation with climate change. Certainly, the trade impacts to the lobstermen and other fishing communities should be something we do to help them, the threat of offshore drilling in the Atlantic. And let's get them some more financial support if there is too much burden to implement the technologies and strategies that have been represented here.

But the North Atlantic right whale is running out of time, and we should not move the goalpost on these critically endangered species in this way.

Mr. Chair, I request a ''no'' vote on 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 Maine (Mr. GOLDEN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 49, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)(increased by $2,500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to address the critical need to support both our law enforcement and individuals in our communities who are experiencing mental health crisis.

Across this country, one in every ten calls for police response involves a person experiencing a mental health crisis; one in four people killed by police are suffering from a mental illness; one in three people transported to hospital emergency rooms for psychiatric reasons are taken by the police.

Simply put, our police officers are on the front lines in our Nation where far too few people have access to the mental healthcare they need and deserve. But far too few have the training and the skills they need to understand, identify, and deescalate these situations.

We need to provide our officers with the skills and understanding of mental illness and how to appropriately respond to both the safety of the officer and the individual. The right training makes everyone safer. We must equip officers for encounters with people experiencing mental health crises, and my amendment helps to accomplish this goal.

With this amendment, we can help save lives and turn these encounters into effective responses that help both the individual and our communities. My amendment funds grants for crisis training for law enforcement through the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program. This program is giving State, local, and Tribal governments the critical support they need to provide individuals with important training and education, and equipment to operate at their best.

Byrne JAG is the leading source of funding for local law enforcement to help prevent and control crime, improve the justice system, and funds everything from education and intervention programs to reentry services to target the roots of crime. Some of its most well-known programs include the bulletproof vests program, Smart Policing Initiative, and the Juvenile Indigent Defense, the National Missing Unidentified Person System, and numerous other programs.

Byrne JAG is a critical funding source that makes our community safer by attacking the problem of crime from multiple angles, from community education to improving interactions with police and the neighborhoods they protect and, thus, is an excellent way to provide mental health crisis response training for our police officers.

Mr. Chair, in my State of Oklahoma, officers in 2018 alone transferred 17,860 individuals experiencing a mental health crisis to the emergency room.

Behavorial and psychological science has progressed leaps and bounds in the last 50 years, but access to that training is expensive, and we must break down cost barriers for law enforcement agencies to save lives and address mental illness.

Mr. Chair, I look forward to, and urge, support on this amendment that will make our communities safer and address mental illness.

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

□ 1100

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. GOLDEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Mr. KIM, 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 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 48, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 54, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 55, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

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

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer this amendment to H.R. 3055 on behalf of my colleague, Representative ANDY KIM.

Over the past decade, more than 400 Veteran Treatment Courts have been established across our country. These courts address a serious problem to those who served. For veterans with post-traumatic stress, substance abuse simply compounds the issues that they face on a daily basis.

More than 2 out of 10 veterans with post-traumatic stress also experience substance abuse problems. These are service men and women who gave much to our country, only to come back and struggle long after their time in uniform has come to an end.

As representatives of a grateful Nation, we owe them solutions to the problems they face. Veteran Treatment Courts have been that solution for thousands of veterans and they continue to be so.

That is why this amendment would increase funding for this lifesaving program by $1 million. That is funding to help provide an alternative to incarceration for those in need. That is funding to help improve access to mental health services and rehabilitative care. That is funding to improve the functionality of our local VA services and better serve those who served us.

This is a proven program that addresses a critical need in a community that has given much to this country. Let's join together today to give something back to them.

With that, I urge adoption of this commonsense amendment. I have seen these courts at work in such positive ways amongst my brothers and sisters who served in the military.

I want to thank Representative ANDY KIM for offering 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 Maine (Mr. GOLDEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. MALINOWSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 73 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. Chair, when I visit a synagogue or Jewish community center in my congressional district these days, I usually pass by an armed security guard. Inside, there is talk about safe exit routes and the cost of adding bulletproof glass and other security enhancements.

When I visit mosques during Friday prayers, I have noticed that State Police officers generally, these days, are standing watch outside. My friends at Hindu and Sikh temples are worried as well.

There is a lot of angry, intolerant rhetoric in the United States and other countries like ours these days, and we know it comes from all sides of the political spectrum, but the guards at the gates of places of worship are not there because of a general fear of intolerance. They are there because of a specific threat from a specific group of people.

Domestic terrorists, white supremacists, or neo-Nazi terrorists, like those responsible for the attacks at the Tree of Life Congregation synagogue in Pittsburgh, the synagogue in Poway, California, and the mosque attack in Christchurch, New Zealand.

According to the Anti-Defamation League, 73 percent of terrorist killings in the United States since 2009 have been committed by domestic terrorists who spouted white supremacist ideology, as compared to 23 percent committed by Islamic extremists.

In 2018, there were 50 extremist murders in the United States. All 50 were

committed by adherents of far right-wing extremist groups. Anti-Semitic incidents rose by 60 percent from 2016 to 2017.

If this threat came from outside the United States, we would be consumed by it here in Congress, as we were when we awoke to the urgency of reorienting our national and homeland security strategy to fight al-Qaida after 9/11. That it is coming from within, from our fellow Americans, makes it more sensitive but no less urgent, and there is more work to be done.

Though the FBI acknowledges that domestic terrorists claim more lives in the United States than international terrorists, it has told us that its counterterrorism case numbers line up around 20 percent for domestic terrorism, 80 percent for international terrorism.

The Department of Justice's senior official for dealing with its Domestic Terrorism Counsel runs what is basically a one-man operation. And in the last 2 years we have actually cut funding at the Department of Homeland Security to counter domestic violent extremism.

This amendment begins to correct the imbalance. It would add $1 million to the budget of DOJ's National Security Division to be directed to the Domestic Terrorism Counsel. In the underlying bill, we already recommend that the Counsel be elevated to have a Deputy Assistant Attorney General with adequate staff and resources.

The goal is to give a senior official at the Justice Department the stature and the tools needed to lead this effort so that we can focus as much attention on the rising threat of domestic terrorism as we have rightly devoted to the threat from groups like al-Qaida and ISIS.

So let us do more than just condemn anti-Semitism and other forms of hateful intolerance in this body. Let us actually do something practical to protect people from violence.

Mr. Chair, I urge bipartisan support for this amendment, and look forward to working with my colleagues on all sides to advance this goal in the year ahead.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 75 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 76, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 76, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Colorado (Neguse) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that would provide an additional $1 million increase to the NASA Office of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Engagement for the purpose of supporting the National Space Grant College and Fellowship Program also known as Space Grant.

I first want to thank Chairman SERRANO and the House Appropriations Committee for providing $48 million for the Space Grant Program, especially given that the President's fiscal year 2020 budget request proposed an entire elimination of not only the Space Grant Program, but also the entire Office of STEM Engagement.

Founded in 1989, the NASA Space Grant Program is made up of a national network of colleges and universities. It is a program that inspires, educates, and develops America's future technological workforce with hands-on projects, courses, and research, ensuring that our next generation is excited and equipped to thrive in our Nation's aeronautics and space programs.

I would be remiss if I didn't say that my district, Colorado's Second District, which I am proud to represent, is home to three Space Grant consortium members: Colorado State University in Fort Collins; the University of Colorado in Boulder; and Front Range Community College.

These institutions support almost 300 students, preparing them for successful STEM careers. In April, I was proud to lead a bipartisan letter with the entire Colorado delegation in support of this program.

The program doesn't just provide benefits to my home State, but to the entire country, Space Grants consist of over 850 affiliates and 52 total consortia across the country. There is one in every State, as well as the District of Columbia.

From reaching Mars, to exploring the depths of the galaxy, if we want to ensure that our Nation remains on a path of discovery and innovation, we must invest in our students and education.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment before them, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I have seen firsthand the positive impacts of NASA's Space Grant College and Fellowship Program in my home State of Alabama, and because of the good work that has come out of that, I urge adoption of the amendment, to further our students' STEM education opportunities. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama, and as he articulated, I think there is incredible work happening with respect to the Space Grant Program in his State, in my State, and in States across the country.

With that, I appreciate the ability to offer the amendment, and I urge a ''yes'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 76 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 51, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of funding for a critical, life-saving program, the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, or NICS. We know that background checks save lives.

Since the NICS background check system was put into effect, over 38 million background checks have been conducted, preventing over 3 million firearm purchases from ending up in the wrong hands.

In 2018, Colorado conducted 340,816 checks against the NICS system with 6,279 denials. Making sure that guns are not sold to people who should not have them is one of the most important things we can do to prevent gun violence. But we can, and we must do more to strengthen the background check system.

The dangers of an incomplete system are clear. Just about 2 years ago in November of 2017, a gunman walked into a church in Sutherland Springs, Texas, and fatally shot more than two dozen people.

The shooter was prohibited from owning a firearm due to a domestic violence conviction he received while serving in the military, but the Air Force failed to upload the proper record to NICS, and the gunman was able to pass a background check and purchase the firearm that he used in that massacre.

In response to that incident, this body authorized additional funds to

support the efforts of States and Federal agencies to submit critical criminal history and mental health records to NICS. The need for these funds was underscored just 2 months ago in April in my home State of Colorado.

A Florida woman who should not have been able to buy a gun and could not have bought one in her home State, traveled to Colorado, passed a background check, and purchased a shotgun. Schools around the region were forced to close as authorities searched for the woman following credible threats made to schools across the Front Range.

These episodes underscore why it is so critically important that we increase funding for the NICS program so that we can continue to enhance it and improve it, and ultimately save lives.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment to try to prevent gun violence in our country. And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1115

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MS. OCASIO-CORTEZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 78 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 35, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 48, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 54, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 55, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment moving $5 million from the Drug Enforcement Administration into the Comprehensive Opioid Abuse Program, which is part of the Department of Justice funding of initiatives to combat the opioid epidemic.

I offer this amendment because ending the war on drugs has to mean changing our priorities in order to keep all communities safe and healthy. The best way we do that is by offering people the help and support they need before arrest and criminalization should be considered in the first place.

The amendment is a relatively commonsense one. As of now, the DEA will be funded at $2.36 billion, which is nearly a $90 million 1-year increase and $77.7 million above even the President's request.

The Bronx has an unprecedented opioid crisis with deadly overdoses nearly doubling in just a few years. As families across our Nation know, the opioid crisis is not limited just to the Bronx. Just yesterday in the Oversight and Reform Committee, we heard testimony from medical experts and providers, and the testimony from Nurse Gray from West Virginia struck me. She said that we cannot arrest ourselves out of this. We have to make sure that we are caring for people in order to prevent this crisis from exploding.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of my colleague from the Bronx's amendment.

Opioids are a serious threat to the health and well-being of our communities, and we must do everything we can to combat this epidemic.

Within the Department of Justice grant programs, the bill provides $501 million in funding, an increase of $33 million for grants to combat the crisis. This funding includes drug and veterans courts, residential treatment, and for the first time, a grant program for Law Enforcement Assistance Diversion, or LEAD, which seeks to get individuals into treatment and out of the criminal justice system.

The addition of this amendment further strengthens a bill that increases grants for treatment and prevention.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, it should be noted here that the comprehensive opioid addiction grants in this bill have been increased by 360 percent since they were created in 2017. Of course, opioid abuse and addiction is a very big problem in this country, and, certainly, we need to work on that, so I do not oppose the gentlewoman's amendment.

But please know, it should be noted that we have increased this by 360 percent, but we want to work with both sides to make sure that we have the appropriate funds necessary to make sure we fight this opioid addiction that has taken over so many parts of the country.

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

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chair, I think in that common spirit and our desire to make sure that we address the opioid epidemic, just as the epidemic is exploding, so should our commitment to address this problem.

This amendment is supported by the NAACP, the ACLU, the Drug Policy Alliance, and dozens of other organizations. Again, this is a relatively commonsense amendment. We have overfunded one agency, and we should move that to make sure we are getting people the care that they need.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MS. OMAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 79 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 37, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 3055.

My amendment addresses the misguided use of solitary confinement within our Nation's prison systems and the harmful impact it has on incarcerated populations.

Solitary confinement is torture. For people with mental health issues, landing in solitary not only produces behaviors that yield more time in solitary, but it can also extend prison sentences, sometimes drastically. For these already vulnerable people, solitary confinement generates a cycle of punishment that for some can literally be endless.

In many prisons in this country, the de facto penalty for even minor prison rules violations, including those obviously caused by psychological distress or disability, has become solitary confinement. The isolation of solitary almost inevitably causes a measurable deterioration in mental health, which in turn leads to more behavioral issues punished with more solitary confinement.

Oftentimes, someone who was only supposed to spend a couple of years in prison ends up spending the rest of their life there, or they end up returning because they have been so damaged by solitary confinement that they can't adjust to life outside of prison.

This vicious cycle of violence must end. Individuals with underlying psychological disabilities are already overrepresented in prisons and jails, and this inhumane, inexcusable punishment is only perpetuating those problems. That is why we must put an end to solitary confinement once and for all.

I believe that, together, we can reform this cycle.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise to support the amendment. My colleague sends an important message by calling attention to the misuse and overuse of solitary confinement in Federal correction and detention.

In 2016, the National Institute of Justice issued a detailed study of the use of restrictive housing in U.S. detention. In addition, the Office of Inspector General in 2017 reported on the use of restrictive housing for mentally ill persons in the custody of BOP and included 15 recommendations to improve how BOP treats such inmates.

While solitary confinement represents a small percentage of restrictive housing, it is particularly concerning because of evidence that its use can be harmful and even counterproductive to correctional objectives.

Mr. Chair, I encourage the Department to take note of the concerns expressed here, and I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Chair, I urge support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, the goal of the Department of Justice is to house inmates in the least restrictive environment that is possible and at the same time provide safety and security for the staff, for the inmate population, and to the public in general.

Just as in the community, disruptive individuals occasionally need to be placed in a jail or a holding facility to maintain the safety of its residents. The Bureau of Prisons has to place disruptive inmates in restrictive housing in order to maintain safety and security for the overall well-being of all the inmates.

The appropriate and reasonable use of restrictive housing is critical to the safety of the staff and to the Bureau's policies and procedures, and they try to strike an appropriate balance between the safety of those individuals who are on the staff there working at the Bureau of Prisons but also for the inmates themselves.

Restrictive housing involves two inmates per cell, in the vast majority of cases, and the inmates have daily access to staff and to programming. It is only in very rare cases that inmates are in a single cell in restrictive housing—for example, an inmate who has killed a cellmate or an inmate who has made repetitive or credible threats to kill anyone who is housed with him.

Every year, we mourn the loss of dedicated corrections professionals who lose their lives while they are working to ensure our Nation's inmates can no longer harm members of the community and harm each other.

We must not attempt to substitute our judgment here on this House floor for that of the highly trained corrections professionals at the Bureau of Prisons and the United States Marshals Service. I think to do so would be a disservice and would make their jobs even more dangerous.

Mr. Chair, I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 81 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 48, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Page 53, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bill that would increase funding for the court-appointed special advocate, or CASA, and guardian ad litem programs.

In 2017, nine out of every 1,000 American children were victims of abuse or neglect. These experiences have a lasting effect, impacting a child's future in ways that are often not apparent in the days, weeks, or months after the trauma of abuse or neglect occurs. Providing support and advocacy for these children can make an enormous difference in their lives, and that is where the CASA program comes in.

CASA serves abused, neglected, and abandoned children through the recruitment and training of volunteers who advocate on behalf of children in courtrooms and other settings.

Mr. Chair, imagine being a 6-year-old child suffering from parental abuse. Home is not a safe place, and the secret that you, at only 6 years old, carry with you every day prevents you from speaking to your friends and your teachers and keeps you from making friends and building relationships.

Now, Mr. Chair, imagine that a neighbor calls the police after overhearing abuse. You are finally removed from a home that is filled with traumatic memories, but you are now looking at a scary and uncertain future in the foster system, and you will have to face your abuser in court.

That is where the CASA program comes in. They step in to provide a lifeline, a guide, a friend, and an advocate for the child. Every year, more than 85,000 volunteers advocate on behalf of the 260,000 children who experience abuse and neglect. CASA advocates help these children find their voices or even speak for them as they navigate the child welfare system.

CASA of Orange County has worked with more than 7,050 children in the 34 years that the program has served our community, and they have trained nearly 3,500 volunteers.

CASA of Orange County used essential funding to support Malena, an 11-year-old Orange County resident diagnosed with autism. In the 2½ years that she was in foster care, Malena lived in a group home, a foster home, a nurturing relative placement, and then a group home again. Throughout all of those changes, Malena had one consistent person in her life that she knew she could count on, her court-appointed special advocate.

That CASA was a steady force in attending countless meetings with her team to support and advocate for her needs. But her relationship with her CASA was so much more, teaching her things that she missed in childhood, such as how to tie her shoes, how to count money, how to write her name, and when her birthday was.

At CASA of Orange County and other CASAs across the country, their mantra is ''I am for the child.''

As a mother of three children, I am proud to stand here as an advocate for children in Orange County and across the country who experience abuse and neglect.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 82 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 48, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 53, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bill that would increase funding for sexual assault kit backlogs, helping us to test the hundreds of thousands of untested rape kits across the country.

I have 5 minutes to speak about my amendment today, and during this time, three people in this country will suffer sexual assault.

□ 1130

That works out to every 92 seconds someone is sexually assaulted in our country. Let me repeat that: every 92 seconds. And, in most cases, the perpetrators of these sexual assaults will never be held accountable. According to the Rape, Abuse and Incest National Network, only 5 out of every 1,000 rapists will end up in prison.

We have an opportunity today to support victims of sexual assault by increasing funding to process the backlog of sexual assault kits that are waiting to be tested across the country. Having the data and information that a sexual assault kit can provide is essential to solving sexual assaults and preventing future assaults.

In my home State of California, there are 13,615 kits untested. We are failing every single one of those 13,615 victims whose rape kit is sitting and waiting for our attention, and we are failing tens of thousands more across the country, including those who will be sexually assaulted by a perpetrator whose DNA will sit untested for a crime already committed.

It costs an average of $1,000 and $1,500 to test a single rape kit. The lack of critical funding needed for these testing kits is the primary factor in the ever-growing backlog of untested kits. In 2016, the Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance gave Orange County a nearly $2 million grant to process more than 3,500 unprocessed kits, to investigate and prosecute cases, and to reengage survivors.

My amendment, which increases the funding in this legislation by $1 million, could help test approximately another 1,000 rape kits in California and across the country. The amendment would bring the total funding up to $50 million, which will only provide enough Federal funding for the testing of up to 50,000 kits. While that is enough to give answers to the 13,000 sexual assault victims waiting for analysis and help in California, because of a lack of data nationwide, we don't know exactly how many sexual assault kits are waiting in this country.

This funding likely isn't enough, and we know that. But Congress must do more to ensure that we are supporting the victims of sexual assault in this country. Increasing funding can play an important role, while it is not alone enough.

We need to support our State and local partners in addressing the backlog of rape kits through increased funding, through new policies for kit testing, and through improved training for those in the field.

I hope that this increase in funding helps us continue the conversation and raise more awareness about sexual assault and about the kit backlog.

I hope that survivors of sexual assault know that Members of Congress are fighting for them, and I hope they hear me and believe that this fight for justice won't end with this amendment. We need to support the victims of sexual assault across this country who deserve to have their kits tested, who deserve justice. We can and must do more.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CLEAVER). Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

I think that this is a very important issue, and I think this needs to be dealt with. Increased funding to reduce the sexual assault kit backlog is very important, so we support the amendment.

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

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for their support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 83 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 53, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chair, during a recent Oversight and Reform Committee hearing, of which I am a member, on Ban the Box, an advocate and formerly incarcerated mother testified that ''People do not go to prison; families do.''

From personal experience and a career spent in community and advocating on behalf of families destabilized by mass incarceration, I know firsthand the trauma that comes from having a parent involved in the criminal justice system.

We must break the chains that keep families ensnarled by the mass incarceration system generation after generation. We must end the prison industrial complex that has brought so much devastation and trauma to many families and communities.

As many as 2.7 million children have at least one parent in prison or jail. That is 1 in 9 Black children, 1 in 28 Latino children, and 1 in 57 White children. Too many children are bearing the trauma, the shame, and the stigma that often comes along with having a parent or caregiver incarcerated.

In the Massachusetts Seventh, which I am fortunate to represent, a Boston reentry study that tracked formerly incarcerated men and women found that over half of respondents had less than $400 in their pockets upon release from prison; about a third went to unstable or temporary housing in shelters and transitional housing programs, motels, or on the street; and fewer than half were in paid employment after 2 months.

Mass incarceration and the lingering effects of a criminal record have a profound impact on families. From unemployment and financial instability to eviction and hunger for families involved in our criminal injustice system, incarceration is, quite literally, a shared sentence.

As lawmakers, as mothers, as fathers, as brothers, as sisters, we can and must do better.

My amendment would increase funds to support the Children of Incarcerated Parents Program and help reduce the harms of parental incarceration and alleviate generational trauma. In the wealthiest Nation on Earth, we must ensure that all families can truly have a second chance. Funding for these programs will help provide that.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 50, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which would provide increased funding to support the DOJ's Community-Based Violence Prevention program. This program provides crucial funding to tackle the epidemic of violence ravaging our communities.

In my district, the Massachusetts Seventh, this program supports the Boston Public Health Commission's Violence Intervention and Prevention Initiative. The VIP Initiative specifically operates in neighborhoods severely impacted by gun violence but

maintains strong community infrastructure. Each neighborhood has its own resident coalition that is coordinated by a local organization with deep ties to the community.

VIP, like other similar programs, empowers communities by providing the knowledge and resources necessary to create long-term solutions to the persistent socioeconomic and systemic issues sustaining the public health epidemic of gun violence.

Violence begets violence. Whether it is domestic violence, sexual violence, gun violence, or gang and street violence, we must stop treating it as an issue of law and order but, rather, invest in the public and social needs of our most vulnerable people and communities.

My amendment will support initiatives that are led and informed by the community to help stem the violence devastating our communities. It centers those closest to the pain closest to the power and the solutions.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MS. STEVENS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 85 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 26, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000) (increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 3055.

This bipartisan amendment removes and adds $2 million from the Legal Activities account at the Department of Justice.

I would like to make the intent of this amendment clear, that Congress is directing the DOJ's Environment and Natural Resources Division to allocate $2 million to enforce our Nation's animal welfare laws.

Congress has taken meaningful steps over the past several decades, and especially in the past few years, to improve animal welfare and rid this country of heartless cruelty toward animals. These improvements include the passage of legislation like the Horse Protection Act, the crush video law, the Animal Welfare Act and animal fighting laws, which received overwhelming bipartisan support.

While our animal rights laws have improved, there are currently insufficient resources to ensure that these laws are being adequately enforced.

The Environment and Natural Resources Division, or ENRD, oversees many important functions, including pollution cleanup and wildlife protection. This division also has the unique responsibility to prosecute animal welfare crimes. ENRD lawyers at the Department of Justice are doing the best they can to defend the humane treatment of captive, farmed, and companion animals across the country, but there are currently not enough resources being allocated for them to go after animal welfare crimes.

Failure to adequately enforce these laws harms communities and animals—the truly voiceless. Failure to enforce these laws leaves animals to suffer tremendously at the hands of people who force animals to fight to the death for pure entertainment and/or other cruel actions.

Mr. Chair, I use this opportunity to urge DOJ to coordinate with USDA and continue working with the U.S. Attorney's offices to prosecute and investigate animal welfare crimes. Specifically, DOJ should create a dedicated animal cruelty crimes unit and allow for robust enforcement of animal welfare crimes. There should be dedicated personnel, including prosecutors, focused solely on these offenses.

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

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST).

□ 1145

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS) for her incredible leadership on an issue we should all be able to agree upon: protecting all of God's creatures, great and small.

When Congress creates laws, we intend for them to be enforced. That is pretty simple. The Stevens amendment would help the Department of Justice do exactly that.

This issue is bigger than senseless animal abuse. There is an established link between animal fighting and abuse and drug trafficking and gang activity. This means that laws protecting animals also protect our communities.

This amendment is common sense, and I urge support.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MS. UNDERWOOD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 89 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of Division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to argue, in the conduct of any litigation to which the United States, or an agency or officer thereof is a party, that any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148; 124 Stat. 119) or of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152), is unconstitutional or is invalid or unenforceable on any ground, including that certain provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act are not severable from section 5000A of that Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which will prevent Federal funds from being used by the Department of Justice to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

The people of the Illinois 14th elected me to protect coverage for preexisting conditions and to make healthcare and prescription drugs more affordable. Under this administration, the Department of Justice is refusing to defend the law of the land, risking access to affordable care for 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions, including 5.4 million Illinoisans.

If this administration succeeds in overturning the Affordable Care Act through the courts, it would destroy protections for people with preexisting conditions, the ban on lifetime and annual limits on health coverage, the Medicaid expansion covering 15 million Americans, health insurance affordability tax credits assisting 9 million Americans, bans on discriminatory insurance practices that force women to pay more for coverage, young adults' ability to remain on their parents' insurance until 26, and more.

This is unacceptable, and to do it on the dime of the taxpayer is unconscionable.

130 million Americans depend on it, and one of those Americans is Mike DeBow, of Shorewood, Illinois. Mike has type 1 diabetes and wrote to me because he is ''deathly afraid'' of losing his insurance. He is thankful for the protections of the Affordable Care Act that allow him to stay on his parents' plan and ensure insurance companies can't discriminate against him because of his preexisting condition.

We cannot go back, back to the days before the Affordable Care Act when insurers were in the driver's seat, allowed to sell substandard plans that didn't cover the care people needed, and left patients holding the bag. We cannot go back to the days when 50 million people in this country were uninsured, locked out because of preexisting conditions.

The American people sent a resounding message last November: They want their healthcare protected. They want their healthcare to be affordable. We should be working toward that aim, not using taxpayer dollars to try to sabotage it for political gain.

For example, we passed legislation in this House that would protect people with preexisting conditions, H.R. 1010, and another bill, the Health Care Affordability Act, that I proposed, which would reduce premium costs for approximately 20 million Americans and offer at least 9 million people who are currently uninsured lower cost coverage.

That is what we should be doing for the American people: using our offices to make their lives better, healthier, safer, and more affordable. For some, like Mike DeBow, this is literally life and death.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This administration remains committed to providing more affordable healthcare options to all Americans, and debating the prospects of future judicial action will not help us, as a Congress, deliver on our promise to bring better healthcare to our constituents. The administration has promised to ensure that, regardless of the outcome, they will support the legislation to address any legal determination.

In addition, let me say, it is not appropriate for Congress to tell the executive branch what positions it should take in court. Litigation strategy is the responsibility and the prerogative of the Department of Justice.

As the Attorney General recently testified during one of our committee hearings here on Capitol Hill, he said that they should be able to advance what he believes are defensible and reasonable legal positions, and I believe that certainly to be the case.

The Attorney General has concluded that the position of the States that challenge the ACA and the district courts is a defensible and reasonable legal position for the Department to take.

Questions of constitutionality should be determined by the courts and not through a partisan debate on funding limitation to an appropriations bill. So, therefore, Mr. Chair, I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise to support the amendment.

When, in March, the Justice Department broke with the principle that its core mission should be to defend, not sabotage, the law of the land, it went too far.

The White House is entitled to push its own policy position on healthcare—it has made no secret of its hostility to the Affordable Care Act, despite never offering an alternative of any kind—but it cannot pick and choose which laws to support.

My friends across the aisle criticized the Obama administration for its use of prosecutorial discretion. In this case, the Department is not just neglecting to defend the law, it is using appropriated funds to directly attack it.

This amendment will, hopefully, stop that, and that is why I strongly support it.

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED) for his leadership in introducing legislation at the beginning of this Congress that allowed this body, the U.S. House of Representatives, to defend the Affordable Care Act in the existing litigation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Texas, and I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO).

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank Ranking Member ADERHOLT and Chairman SERRANO for working together on the bipartisan en bloc package that passed the House yesterday. That package included my amendment to increase funding for the International Trade Administration by $2 million to provide additional funding for enforcement and compliance activities.

Unfair trade practices directly harm our domestic manufacturing and agricultural sectors. The U.S. Customs and Border Protection reports that there are nearly 55,000 unpaid antidumping and countervailing duty bills covering fiscal years 2011 through 2016, totaling $2.8 billion in uncollected duties. This is a critical issue for my district.

Americans who eat U.S.-grown strawberries in the colder winter months are probably eating a strawberry grown and harvested by the hardworking farmers in Plant City, Florida. We are proud of our role in providing Americans access to U.S.-grown produce year-round.

However, the strawberry growers in my district are under attack. They are under attack from illegal ''dumping'' practices, and this must be stopped. The additional funding provided by my amendment is a step in the right direction to combat unfair trade practices so that U.S. producers can compete.

Again, I want to express my gratitude to Ranking Member ADERHOLT and Chairman SERRANO for including this amendment in the en bloc package that passed the House yesterday.

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF GEORGIA

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 445, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ). The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 100, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, and 125 printed in part B of House Report 116–119, offered by Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 111, line 17, after the first dollar amount, inset ''(reduced by $3,000,000.00)''.

Page 118, line 8, after the first dollar amount, inset ''(increased by $2,000,000.00)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. YOHO OF FLORIDA

Page 115, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000) (increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 168, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $100,000) (reduced by $100,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

Page 118, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000) (reduced by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

Page 111, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 125 line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

Page 125, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 125, line 15, after the second dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Page 162, line 4, after the second dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000) (increased by $10,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MS. SEWELL OF ALABAMA

Page 154, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1) (reduced by $1)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. BERA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 159, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000) (reduced by $2,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

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

SEC. ____. There is appropriated, for salaries and expenses of the Farm Service Agency to carry out section 1621 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8792), $1,996,000, to be derived from a reduction of $2,000,000 in the amount provided in this Act for the item for ''Office of the Secretary'' and ''Office of the Secretary—Office of Communications''.

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Page 118, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 118, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MR. VEASEY OF TEXAS

Page 121, line 19, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $12,000,000) (increased by $12,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. STEIL OF WISCONSIN

Page 125, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,500,000) (reduced by $1,500,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Page 109, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,600,000)''.

Page 109, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 109, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 110, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $600,000)''.

Page 111, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,400,000)''.

Page 214, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Page 204, line 16, insert '', or any territory or possession of the United States'' after ''average''.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. JOYCE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 121, line 19, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000) (increased by $15,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. LAMB OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 111, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000)''.

Page 159, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $200,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 114, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1)(increased by $1)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. COX OF CALIFORNIA

Page 204, line 14, strike ''1980, 1990,'' and insert ''1990''.

AMENDMENT NO. 116 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE OF COLORADO

Page 112, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 113, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $$1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 117 OFFERED BY MRS. CRAIG OF MINNESOTA

Page 111, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $353,000)''.

Page 153, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $353,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 118 OFFERED BY MRS. CRAIG OF MINNESOTA

Page 157, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 119 OFFERED BY MR. TRONE OF MARYLAND

Page 109, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 109, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 109, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 158, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 OFFERED BY MR. TRONE OF MARYLAND

Page 109, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 110, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 119, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 122 OFFERED BY MRS. AXNE OF IOWA

Page 114, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduce by $1) (increased by $1)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MRS. LEE OF NEVADA

Page 109, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 109, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 109, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 159, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 124 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 109, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 109, line 7, after the second dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 206, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 OFFERED BY MS. SLOTKIN OF MICHIGAN

Page 119, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amendments included in the en bloc were made in order by the rule, and they have been agreed to by both sides. They improve the bill. I support the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment as well.

I want to thank the Agriculture Subcommittee chairman, Mr. BISHOP, for working with our side to include many amendments that are important to our Members. The chairman has been a great partner and has been very fair throughout this process.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, as it reflects the will of many Members and also makes appropriate changes to the bill.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

□ 1200

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Chair, I would like to thank so much the subcommittee chairperson, Mr. BISHOP, for allowing me this time.

My amendment is part of the en bloc, and it deals with wastewater treatment.

No person in America and living in this country should be allowed to not have adequate plumbing. This is why I have introduced an amendment asking the USDA to prioritize our ongoing efforts to address failing septic systems in rural communities.

Approximately 20 percent of Americans are responsible for the installation and maintenance of their own sewage disposal systems, which isn't provided by their municipalities or their county government. At least 200,000 families live in homes that lack a sewage system altogether.

We offer little assistance to people who live in unincorporated areas to have basic water and sewer. Rural communities across this country struggle with this issue.

Just this week, I read lots and lots of articles that dealt with the failure of those folks in rural communities to have adequate sewage systems.

This amendment is part of a multiyear effort to address this once and for all for all Americans.

Last year, my bill, the Rural Septic Tank Access Act, was included in the farm bill.

Madam Chair, I thank Chairman BISHOP and his staff for allowing me to speak on this underlying en bloc bill today.

In fiscal year 2018, we secured an additional $1.8 billion in rural wastewater funding with the help of Congressman ADERHOLT.

Madam Chair, again, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' for this en bloc amendment.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague and ranking member, Mr. FORTENBERRY, for yielding, and I thank Chairman BISHOP for including my amendment in the en bloc amendments.

Agriculture research plays a critical role in the future of our food supply. In our last spending bill, we helped secure

a 5 percent increase in funding for the USDA's National Institute of Food and Agriculture. That program had seen increased funding because of bipartisan support on the House Agriculture Committee from many of the members, including my good friend and fellow cochair of the Ag Research Caucus, JIMMY PANETTA of California, who fondly likes to remind us all that he represents the Salad Bowl of America.

This year, I led a bipartisan letter signed by 111 of my colleagues advocating for robust funding for USDA NIFA's Agriculture and Food Research Initiative in the 2020 appropriations and I am extremely excited that the House appropriators increased funding by $45 million over fiscal year 2019 levels to $460 million for NIFA and AFRI.

I am proud to see such bipartisan support for ag research, because ensuring research is necessary and vital.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE).

Mr. TRONE. Madam Chair, I am pleased that the four amendments I proposed to this bill will be made in order. These amendments reflect some of the most important priorities in my district.

First, they offer an amendment to increase funding for mental health courts, which lower the recidivism rate for justice-impacted individuals with mental illness.

My second amendment underlines the importance of modernizing the National Institute of Standards and Technology's infrastructure. This funding will help NIST remain a leader in driving economic growth in Maryland's Sixth District and across the country.

The last two amendments put additional funding toward expanding rural broadband deployment and combatting the opioid crisis in rural communities, two critical priorities of western Maryland.

Madam Chair, I thank Representatives Riggleman of Virginia and Neguse of Colorado for working with me on these amendments.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. STEIL. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Nebraska and my colleague, Mr. BISHOP, for including this amendment in the en bloc.

I rise to support my amendment to support our dairy industry. I have visited farms across southeast Wisconsin, and time and time again, farmers have explained to me the challenges they have with consistently low milk prices.

That is why we need this amendment, so we can continue to invest in business development within the dairy industry and encourage new markets for our farmers.

This amendment provides $1.5 million to support our Nation's dairy industry in a budget neutral way.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support our dairy industry, to support our farmers, and to support this amendment.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGGLEMAN).

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, Representative TRONE, with whom I have developed a bipartisan partnership that has resulted in these two amendments.

The first amendment increases funding for Community Connect Grants to connect broadband deployment into rural communities that are underserved by private sector investment.

Our rural communities, including some in my district, need access to broadband to keep up with the demands of the modern economy.

This amendment will help communities close the digital divide, which is critical to enhancing economic opportunity, job creation, access to healthcare, and education in rural America.

The next amendment, dear to my heart, increases funding for the Rural Health and Safety Education Program to combat the opioid epidemic in rural communities.

Representative TRONE and I and too many others in this body and in our country at large have seen friends and family members suffer and even pass away from the opioid crisis that has ravaged our country. Just last week, I lost my cousin to a heroin overdose.

This funding is an essential step to turn the crisis around.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support these two amendments.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I thank Ranking Member FORTENBERRY and Chairman BISHOP for including in this en bloc group amendment my bipartisan amendment No. 103 to provide funding for the Reimbursement Transportation Cost Payment Program for Geographically Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers.

This program in USDA will reimburse farmers and ranchers in Puerto Rico, as well as in other U.S. foreign territories, Hawaii and Alaska, a portion of the costs that they may incur when transporting their agricultural products or equipment.

Our farmers and ranchers outside the continental U.S. operate at a competitive disadvantage relative to producers in the 48 contiguous States, partly due to geographic barriers and high transportation costs.

This program will help us address this reality by providing payments to help ranchers and farmers in the noncontiguous States or territories offset some of these costs.

This program has been funded at $1.9 million over the last couple of fiscal years, and my amendment will seek to provide the same amount of funding for fiscal year 2020, with a corresponding offset.

Madam Chair, I want to thank Representatives GABBARD of Hawaii, PLASKETT of the U.S. Virgin Islands, and RADEWAGEN of American Samoa for cosponsoring my amendment, and I urge my colleagues to endorse it.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, there are no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, at this time, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment.

Madam Chair, we have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Chair, my amendment is intended to ensure that the Northern Mariana Islands Nutritional Assistance Program has enough funding, so that household income eligibility standards and benefit levels currently in place for FY19 are kept in place throughout FY20.

We do not want anyone removed from eligibility or barred from the program because there is not enough money next year.

We do not want anyone to have their benefits cut. We have worked hard and long to raise benefits in the Marianas to match neighboring Guam and to meet the true costs of food in our islands. We do not want that progress lost.

I do not expect cuts to happen. We provided generously for the Marianas in the disaster supplemental appropriation enacted earlier this month, Public Law 116–20. We appropriated $25.2 million for disaster nutrition assistance in response to the Presidentially declared major disasters—we had two last year: Typhoon Mangkut and Super Typhoon Yutu—and for emergencies. And we made the funds available for all fiscal year 2020.

The Marianas had already used $10.6 million of our annual block grant and other monies to pay for disaster nutrition assistance in response to these two typhoons. It is the intent of Congress that the new disaster funding in Public Law 116–20 be applied retroactively to make whole those other funding sources.

Going forward, we are concerned about the economic emergency that has developed in the aftermath of the typhoons. Tourism, the primary driver of the economy, is down significantly; and Commonwealth government revenues have fallen. As a result, local government employees have had their hours reduced from 40 to 32 per week. Public school teachers are being forced to agree to a salary cut. The reduced consumer purchasing power will accelerate the economic downturn.

During the period of recession and government austerity that occurred from 2008 through 2012, the demand on the nutritional assistance program increased by 44 percent. This scenario may well now repeat. Congress recognizes that, because of the nexus between the typhoon disasters and the subsequent economic emergency, any new demand on the nutritional assistance program in fiscal year 2020 should be addressed with disaster funding provided in Public Law 116–20.

It is not certain, however, that the disaster supplemental appropriation will cover all contingencies.

To prepare for any eventuality, the amendment I offer makes clear that SNAP contingency funds are a permissible source should

the Marianas nutritional assistance program face a shortfall in fiscal 2020.

It is a ''belt and suspenders'' proposition. Only needed if, for some reason, disaster funds prove insufficient. This use of the contingency funds is statutorily authorized under the broad discretion given to the Secretary in 48 U.S.C. 1469d(c) to extend to the Marianas any program administered by the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary is also authorized to waive or modify any statutory requirements relating to the provision of assistance under such programs when he deems it necessary in order to adapt the programs to the Marianas needs.

My amendment makes clear Congress' intent: that no household eligible for food assistance under the income standards in effect for FY19 will be denied benefits in FY20 and that the benefit amounts being provided in FY19 will not be reduced in FY20.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 97 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. BANKS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 99 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. BANKS. 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 B (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Each amount made available by this division (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 14 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Chair, my amendment is simple. It would reduce spending in this division by 14 percent, the amount that is needed to avoid busting the budget caps and preventing sequestration, which would compromise our national security.

This division would spend $1.3 billion more than the 2019 enacted level.

In their quest to spend every taxpayer dollar from this generation and our future generations, my friends on the other side of the aisle have proposed spending packages that in total will bust the budget caps by nearly $90 billion.

While my colleagues may be willing to put national security at risk to fulfill budget-busting policy promises, I will not.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I understand the gentleman's intention, but I could not disagree more.

The agriculture bill funds a variety of national priorities from food safety, to agriculture research, to drug approval, to rural development, to nutrition programs for our children.

Reducing spending by 14 percent would hurt our farmers, who are already suffering terribly from retaliatory tariffs, and it would hurt small communities who are still in need of adequate broadband. It would hurt those who are waiting for cures to rare cancers. It would jeopardize America's status as a leader of global agricultural science. It would slow our response to foodborne illness outbreaks. It would harm children and families who rely on these programs to put food on their tables.

The bill already rejected the administration's draconian cuts to programs that assist our rural communities and vulnerable populations.

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

Mr. BANKS. Madam Chair, we have got to think about the audacity of these claims.

I am not talking in my amendment about cutting any specific program. I am proposing an amendment to cut 14 percent across the board to prevent the excessive spending that we are seeing being proposed from across the aisle that would spend substantially more than what the Federal Government spent in the year before.

Madam Chair, we simply cannot afford this reckless proposal from my friends on the other side of the aisle.

My amendment offers Members a clear choice. If a Member votes ''no,'' that Member supports busting the budget caps and putting our national security at risk due to entering into sequestration, which is inevitable if we pass the spending measures being proposed from across the aisle.

However, by supporting my amendment, Members can show that they support fiscal sanity by honoring the budget caps and protecting our national security.

Madam Chair, I will continue to come back to this microphone over and over and over again and propose this same amendment to each nondefense spending division, because I promised my constituents in northeast Indiana that that is exactly what I would do if they elected me to Congress, that I would fight to reduce spending to rebuild our military and to support fiscal sanity in our Nation, once again, by fighting for balanced budgets and fiscally conservative spending measures.

□ 1215

This amendment fulfills all those promises to my constituents and families in northeast Indiana, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I urge that this amendment be rejected.

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

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

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

Mr. BANKS. 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. 101 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 101 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. BIGGS. 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 B (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the draft guidance issued by the Food and Drug Administration in December 2017 titled ''Drug Products Labeled as Homeopathic: Guidance for FDA Staff and Industry''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment that prevents funds from being used to finalize, implement, or enforce the draft guidance issued by the Food and Drug Administration in December of 2017, titled, ''Drug Products Labeled as Homeopathic Guidance for FDA Staff and Industry.''

The 2017 draft guidance actually upends three decades of settled enforcement practice in homeopathy without a compelling reason or with no directive from Congress. My amendment would prevent that overreach and maintain the safe and effective guidance that has been in place since 1987.

For decades, homeopathy has thrived as the fastest growing alternative to pharmaceuticals, and FDA estimates more than 3 million Americans use it. The products can be a natural alternative to addictive opioids in the management of pain and other conditions.

The current guidance provides a precise definition of a homeopathic product and clear manufacturing standards. Violations of these standards are already subject to FDA enforcement. The

proposed change in guidance goes too far by restricting access to safe homeopathic medicines, while also being less effective at regulating the safety and quality of homeopathic products.

The new guidance replaces clear definitions with a vague, risk-based approach. By its own admission, the FDA failed to consult with consumers and those in the homeopathic community before they drafted this guidance. The result is a poorly worded document that does not do what it purports to do.

Instead, this guidance covers all products labeled as homeopathic rather than distinguishing between those falsely labeled as homeopathic and those that are actually homeopathic medicines which have already been proven to be safe and effective. As written, the guidance threatens to limit access to safe and effective homeopathic medicines by subjecting them to new enforcement actions inconsistent with past practice and existing law.

The draft guidance purports to address improperly manufactured homeopathic products, and I support that, but the draft guidance drops the explicit manufacturing guidelines already contained in the existing guidance. Under the draft guidance, Americans would have fewer assurances that their homeopathic medicines are pure and properly manufactured.

The problems that FDA cites as reasons for introducing the draft guidance, falsely labeled products and improperly manufactured products, are actually better addressed under the current guidance, and the FDA has been effectively addressing these issues for the last 30 years.

This draft guidance is an unnecessary regulatory overreach, and I urge all Members to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment primarily to engage in a discussion with the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, first let me say, I do understand the concerns of the gentleman from Arizona.

Here is the issue: The Food and Drug Administration is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that persons seeking to be healed have both the right to try innovative products as well as the right to be protected from harm or any false claims.

So let me say to my friend, Mr. BIGGS, we would like to offer this: Chairman BISHOP and I would seek the opportunity to have the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration, meet with us to dialogue on the very important issues that you are raising and to relay your concerns. I will commit to you that your objections will be conveyed to their leadership before they move forward on this guidance.

So, in light of that consideration, I kindly, respectfully request that the gentleman consider withdrawing the amendment.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for his comments and Ranking Member FORTENBERRY's assurances that we can get together with the FDA and see what we can do to resolve this very difficult issue. I look forward to working with him on this issue going forward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 105 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. PENCE. 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 111, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Page 158, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to increase funding for the Distance Learning and Telemedicine broadband grant program.

Currently, over 14 million Americans living in rural communities still lack access to basic broadband service. Specifically, the rural broadband grant programs at USDA help Americans tap into telehealth technology, distant learning education, and internet-based agribusiness that our farmers desperately rely on to remain competitive.

In my district, the DLT grant program has been successful at linking teachers in one area to students in another. Last year, almost half of the funds from the DLT program were used to combat opioid and substance abuse.

The ongoing opioid crisis is still wreaking havoc on communities across America, and this is not the time to cut corners on programs that address this problem. We must support efforts to help people seeking treatment for and prevention of opioid use.

My amendment, which is fully offset, will increase funding for the DLT program by $25 million so that more communities have access to healthcare, education, government services, and business opportunities. Without broadband access, entire communities are being left behind.

Madam Chair, I am thankful this issue has remained a bipartisan priority, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment.

The Distance Learning and Telemedicine program offers grants to rural areas to provide access to education, to training, and to healthcare. These resources are critical in providing funding to acquire audio, video, and other advanced technology equipment to extend educational and medical services, including those seeking opioid treatment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman BISHOP for yielding the time and for his eloquent remarks.

I just want to rise, even though we are under the guise of opposition, to actually thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. We have had substantive, thoughtful, lengthy discussions about broadband and its importance to rural revitalization, as the gentleman well put, and it is more than just wires laid. It is about creating an ecosystem of livability.

In his words, the gentleman touched on those very points. I think the gentleman would be proud to see the underlying work here in that regard, but he has made it better.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, the amendment would bring the total funding for the program to $75 million in our bill. This program provides grants to encourage and improve telemedicine and distance learning services in rural areas through telecommunications and other technologies, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the gentleman for offering it. It enhances the bill.

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD), my esteemed colleague.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my esteemed colleague's amendment to increase the funding for the Distance Learning and Telemedicine grant program at the USDA.

In Indiana, many of our rural areas do not have access to adequate broadband coverage, putting them at a disadvantage in our global economy. In Indiana, many of our rural areas do not have the access that is necessary to be current.

Broadband is important to education and healthcare, as well as economic development and agriculture. By responsibly increasing the funding for this program, we are providing educational opportunities and improved healthcare without any additional cost to the taxpayer.

We must equip our students with our 21st century tools to further their education and ensure that all of our citizens have access to quality healthcare, regardless of their ZIP Code. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment on behalf of rural communities across the Nation.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to close the digital divide in rural America.

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

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

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

Mr. PENCE. 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.

□ 1230

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 114 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. SPANBERGER. 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 109, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $12,500,000)''.

Page 109, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $12,500,000)''.

Page 109, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $12,500,000)''.

Page 111, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $12,500,000)''.

Page 114, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

Page 207, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $55,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3055.

Across the country, insufficient rural broadband access is creating a divide between those who are connected and those who are not. That is why my amendment increases funding for the USDA's ReConnect Program by $55 million, representing a 10 percent increase over last year's funding.

According to the FCC's 2019 Broadband Deployment Report, one in four rural Virginians lacks access to high-speed internet. This digital divide can lead to consequences that impact educational and economic opportunities across our rural communities. This figure is even more stark when you hear from those affected.

Earlier this year, I sent out a survey to learn more about how the lack of reliable broadband internet is directly impacting the people I serve here in the House of Representatives. I received more than 100 responses in a short amount of time from families, students, and business owners across our district. Take, for example:

Regina from Louisa, who says that the lack of consistent, reliable internet services hinders everything her family does, from receiving reliable emergency notifications to paying their bills in a timely fashion;

Jasmine from Spotsylvania takes online classes at home, but the lack of access to broadband internet has barred her from accessing assignments that she needs to complete in order to obtain her degree; and

Robyn from Amelia County, who works on her family's beef and cattle farm, says: ''When the internet is down, I can't do simple things like process payments, send liability payments, or check the radar for our guys out in the fields.''

For every Regina, Jasmine, and Robyn, there are hundreds of thousands of Americans with similar stories. To level the playing field for our rural residents, we need to make sure broadband internet is a component of our national conversation about infrastructure. That is why I believe we need to expand existing programs such as USDA's ReConnect Program.

This program allows communities to apply for Federal funding to strengthen and expand their regional broadband infrastructure, but the current scope of these programs is insufficient to meet the scale of the challenge and the demand. In the first round of ReConnect Program grant applications this year, USDA saw a nearly 3-to-1 ratio in application funding requested versus the actual amount of funding available.

My amendment would increase the funding for the USDA ReConnect Program from $550 to $605 million, and I am proud to lead this bipartisan effort to provide greater connectivity to rural America.

This extra $55 million is not the magic solution, but it demonstrates that one of our priorities here in Congress is to keep our rural communities strong; and when rural America is strong, it makes our country as a whole even stronger.

By helping our rural neighbors close the broadband gap, we are allowing the rural communities to attract new businesses, spur economic growth, and give their kids an equal opportunity to succeed in a global, hyperconnected economy.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

There is wide support and recognition as to the need for investing in broadband infrastructure. As a necessity for modern life, we must continue our efforts to bridge the broadband divide to ensure that as many rural Americans as possible receive fast and reliable broadband service and the multitude of benefits that are associated with it.

Madam Chair, the gentlewoman's amendment, if adopted, would bring broadband funding to the highest level since 2009, with the Recovery Act. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It will certainly enhance this bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. 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 gentlewoman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MS. UNDERWOOD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 115 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. 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 B (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to remove the term ''climate change'' from any publication of any entity for which such funds are made available.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which will prevent Federal agencies like the U.S. Department of Agriculture from removing existing public information about long-term weather variation in our climate. This information gives farmers the tools they need to succeed, and it is important that we don't subject it to politics.

I am proud to represent a community rich in agriculture in the Illinois 14th

District. We have the best farmers in the world, but right now they are facing real challenges to their businesses and their way of life caused by long-term patterns in weather variation, leading to worse seasonal extremes.

The science is clear: Extreme weather has links to human-induced climate change.

Climate change has broad impacts on virtually all aspects of the agriculture industry. Ignoring the link between climate change and extreme weather is a direct threat to our national security, to food security, and to the livelihoods of farmers in northern Illinois and throughout America.

This year, catastrophic flooding and rain in Illinois have prevented many farmers from planting their crops. As of this week, only 88 percent of farmers in Illinois were able to plant their corn, compared with a 4-year average of 100 percent between 2014 and 2018. Meanwhile, only 70 percent of soybeans are planted, compared to a 4-year average of 95 percent.

Nationwide, farmers are expected to harvest the smallest corn crop in 4 years, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. And I have spoken to farmers who are concerned that an early frost could threaten entire farm operations this year because of late planting and more unpredictable weather patterns.

This is an immediate threat. We are already suffering the consequences, and it will only get worse with time.

The very existence of multigenerational farms and an entire way of life for some families in our community are at risk. And once these farms are gone, they aren't coming back.

Make no mistake. Due to drought, severe storms, an early spring, and flooding, our farmers are on the front line when it comes to climate change.

Unfortunately, over the past 2 years, references to climate change, long-term weather variation, and the effect of human activity on our climate has been scrubbed from many Federal websites and publications.

Farmers are veterinarians, entrepreneurs, accountants, meteorologists, and scientists—all in one day. By deleting information and references to climate change in official communication, we hamstring their ability to rely on accurate and precise information to make important business decisions and adapt their farming practices to face future challenges.

Information on climate change and its impact on agriculture is also valuable to researchers and innovators working on technology to support farming communities throughout the country and to policymakers as we work to make informed choices that address these issues.

We have the capacity and a responsibility to address the challenges of climate change head-on as a country. American farmers are some of the most hardworking, resilient, and optimistic people in the country. Their hard work nourishes our families and literally feeds the world.

We can and must ensure that they are equipped to be successful, because their success not only affects our community's economy, but a secure food supply depends on it. This amendment will ensure that USDA and other Federal agencies will continue to make important information available to farmers at a time when they need it most.

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, trying to control what words USDA officials use to describe changing weather conditions should not really be our focus.

For one, this amendment is a solution in search of a problem. USDA has plenty of materials on their website or elsewhere with the term ''climate change'' embedded in them. If the USDA were going to completely wipe away this terminology for political purposes, which was implied, they would have done so over the past 2½ years.

Secondly, the amendment attempts to politicize an issue that does not need further politicization. For example, Chairman BISHOP and I were able to have a civil discussion on changing climate in a subcommittee hearing this year without dragging controversy into it. In addition to outside witnesses, USDA actually sent up a subject matter expert on the very topic. We had a hearing where we talked about how to deal with changing weather and how our farmers and ranchers could adjust to such changes.

Instead of spending time on this type of messaging, let's spend our time on actually helping our farmers and ranchers and building a more secure and sustainable energy future that benefits all of America.

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. As I have said before, Congress' oversight role is one of the most important functions. That function extends to preserving the integrity of science.

The academics, economists, and researchers at USDA produce top-notch scientific reports characterizing the state of the farm economy, the agricultural industry at large, and analyzing future impacts. It is clear that one of the most important stressors on agriculture today and in the coming years will be the effects of climate change.

We cannot prevent the effects of climate change by simply removing any reference to it in the Department's scientific publications. We must allow the science community to do its work, free from political influence.

Madam Chair, I have no objection to the proposed amendment, and I urge its adoption.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that the amendment No. 121 will not be offered.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of Chairwoman LOWEY, and I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield to my colleague from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), a superb chair of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, and I rise to discuss an issue very important to America's livestock and poultry farmers, the Packers and Stockyards Act.

For decades, the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, familiarly known as GIPSA, was a stand-alone agency within the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Until recently, GIPSA was a parallel agency to the Agricultural Marketing Service itself. But under Secretary Sonny Perdue's reorganization of the Department of Agriculture and consolidation plan, GIPSA was moved deep within the Agricultural Marketing Service—some fear, buried.

Now, the Packers and Stockyards Division of the Fair Trade Practices Branch within the Agricultural Marketing Service administers the Packers and Stockyards Act.

Do you see the layers?

This consolidation will increase difficulty for farmers who seek relief from unfair and abusive practices common—unfortunately—in the livestock and poultry sectors.

The administration recently announced a rulemaking process to define criteria the Secretary will consider to determine violations of the Packers and Stockyards Act on whether an undue or unreasonable preference or advantage occurred.

I welcome this action.

□ 1245

These terms were never adequately defined or explained. However, I am very concerned this administration is

utilizing delays and stalling tactics through this rulemaking process.

For several years, the previous administration's rulemaking process was blocked through appropriations riders. Year after year, I fought those riders.

Finally, Congress reacted to the public backlash over the riders and backed off efforts to block the rule. This enabled the last administration to move forward and to comply with the 2008 farm bill requirements. However, the rulemaking was not complete. With the turnover in administrations, Secretary Perdue quickly stopped all work on these rules and demoted the agency in charge of the effort.

It seems a positive step that the Secretary decided to advance new rules to clarify criteria used to enforce the undue and unreasonable preference or advantage authorities. However, given the administration's previous actions, I am quite concerned that this rulemaking will fall far short of addressing the worst abuses that America's livestock and poultry farmers experience.

There are gross examples of abusive contracting practices, particularly in the poultry sector. Companies greatly disadvantage certain growers at the expense of others. The thumb of justice surely seems obsolete. Protection against retaliation, pay transparency, and a right to a fair and just legal system are essential to protect our hardworking farmers from abuse.

Each of these concerns must be addressed in the rulemaking process. The alarming realities of the poultry industry and similar ones in the hog and beef industries highlight the imbalance within today's corporate meat production hierarchy. This must be addressed through USDA's planned Packers and Stockyards Act rulemaking process.

I hope the administration will better protect small farmers who work very hard every day to help feed our Nation.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I appreciate my colleague's longtime support for fair trade practices for our livestock and for our poultry farmers.

I have worked on this issue over the years with the gentlewoman, and I, too, share her concerns regarding the GIPSA rules and the administration's past history in such rulemakings.

I look forward to working with my colleague from Ohio as the administration takes steps toward complying with the farm bill requirements from 2008.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, as the designee of Chair LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I want to continue to work with the gentleman and the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies to fight the administration's reprehensible attempts to increase hunger in our country, including through USDA's proposed and harmful able-bodied adults without dependents rule.

As the gentleman well knows, SNAP is a critical antihunger program that helps many families struggling with food insecurity. What I find so counterintuitive about this rule is that the most common reason for seeking SNAP is because someone is losing a job, which is even more critical for those who have barriers to employment or who are already at the margins of the workforce.

As many experts have testified to Congress, the labor market experience of SNAP participants, as it is for so many low-paid workers, is highly unstable, and participants tend to cycle in and out of full-time employment.

This rule would cut food aid for between 755,000 and 821,000 individuals from red States, blue States, and purple States, and from rural, urban, and suburban communities, without any regard to the barriers they may face or the fact that they may live in areas or ZIP Codes or Census tracts that lack jobs, or that companies are moving, or other unanticipated egresses from the workforce.

No matter what people say, there are still pockets of high unemployment rates well above the national average. This body must make crystal clear that we support the vulnerable population of able-bodied adults who are being targeted here and that increasing hunger does not increase employability. It does not create new jobs in rural or other areas with high unemployment. It doesn't remove barriers to employment. It just simply increases hunger.

While there are so many good things in this package that will help to attack hunger and food insecurity, I am deeply disappointed that we are missing the opportunity to use Congress' title I power to block this rule. Let's not go down as the did-nothing Congress when it comes to something so common sense as providing food for the most vulnerable.

I am so concerned about this rule's impact on truly vulnerable individuals. Let's not be fooled because we are calling them ''able-bodied.'' These folks have challenges that make finding work difficult. This includes veterans, homeless people, children who have aged out of foster care, and college students.

The vast majority of SNAP participants affected by this proposal live in deep poverty, with 88 percent of households at or below 50 percent of the poverty level.

Madam Chair, 1 in 10 are working, although less than an average of 20 hours a week. One study found that 75 percent participate in the workforce. Of those who do work but sometimes do not, the majority don't work due to their having lost a job or they couldn't get enough hours. This rule would do nothing to address those issues.

Of those who are not in the labor force, 80 percent of them said that it was due to health and disability. This rule would do nothing to address those issues.

I am also concerned about the impact on States. Despite all the wonderful claims of a strong economy, we continue to hear that all boats are not lifted, which is why the existing flexibility to protect people from hunger when jobs are simply not available in some areas is so critical.

Almost every State has used this flexibility under the existing waiver at some point, including some of the most conservative States. If someone claims to support States' rights, that Governors and local elected officials know best about what is going on in their States, especially where we know economic conditions can vary from county to county, city to city, even ZIP Code to ZIP Code, then you should be opposed to this rule.

Punishing poor people will not help them get jobs.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Chairwoman LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COURTNEY). The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak about the fiscal year 2020 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill.

I thank the chairwoman and the ranking member of the full committee and also my ranking member, Mr. JOYCE, for all of his collaboration.

I want people to know that this bill is the proud work, hard work, and collaboration of our subcommittee, which held 16 hearings. We received over 6,000 requests from Members of Congress, and we worked hard to make a bill that reflected the priorities of the entire House.

I also want to note that this bill makes critical investments for the American people and for our planet. It does that because the subcommittee had a recommended total of $37.3 billion in discretionary funding. That is an increase of $1.7 billion over last year.

We also were able to include this year, because of hard work by the subcommittee led by Mr. SIMPSON last year, an additional $2.25 billion in fire cap adjusted funds for suppression operations. That is really important for the Forest Service in order to fight wildland fires without borrowing from nonfire programs.

Some of the biggest increases in this bill, however, honor our Federal and treaty trust responsibilities to provide for the health, safety, and education of our Native American brothers and sisters.

Mr. JOYCE and I, Mr. Chair, worked on this in a very nonpartisan fashion with the entire subcommittee. We can be proud that this bill continues to move us in the right direction in honoring our treaty and trust obligations.

In fact, this bill invests over $10 billion to support and strengthen Tribal self-determination, including $1 billion, the highest ever recommended, for the operation of Native American education programs. As I said, Mr. Chair, we did that together in the subcommittee in a nonpartisan way.

For many other agencies in this bill, however, the Trump administration had devastating cuts.

The President's request was a 31 percent cut to the Environmental Protection Agency, and that cut would have prevented the EPA from its mission to keep our communities safe and healthy.

In fact, under President Trump's watch, yesterday, the administration rolled out what many of us call its dirty power plan. We have evidence from the scientific community to say that it could contribute up to 1,400 premature deaths annually.

Democrats are fighting back on this bill with important investments to protect the air we breathe and the water we drink. We boost support for the EPA's Clean Air Markets programs by $25.6 million, and we increase congressional oversight to make sure that there aren't any rollbacks attempted to put the public health at risk.

We also fund the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund at the authorized level, and we target resources needed to address drinking and wastewater needs.

This bill also takes a huge step forward in building on what was started in the Defense bill that we voted on earlier this week to address the crisis of PFOS, which is contaminating our water.

I am very proud that, after the President signed a bipartisan bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund even though the President zeroed it out in his budget, we chose to invest $524 million in LWCF.

I would like to conclude by talking about climate change for a second. As we know, the administration has cut everywhere it can to decimate Federal funding to do research and combat and adapt to climate change. Our bill does the opposite. It boosts funding for climate change research, tracking and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions, and energy and water efficiency programs in the EPA. The U.S. Geological Survey has its role to play on climate, and we support that. It also restores very important programs on this that were eliminated in the Fish and Wildlife Service.

This bill recognizes the importance of science to understand the impacts of climate change in our natural and cultural resources, in our ecosystems, and in human health.

It is a good bill, and I think as we go through it, Mr. Chair, and listen to the amendments we can make a good bill even better.

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

□ 1300

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM OF MINNESOTA

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 445, as the designee of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 126, 138, 141, 142, 152, 153, 155, 159, 160, 164, 169, 170, 171, 172, 175, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 192, and 193 printed in part B of House Report 116–119, offered by Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota:

AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 138 OFFERED BY MS. DEGETTE OF COLORADO

Page 288, line 24, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000) (increased by $3,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 141 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA OF ARIZONA

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the transfer of jurisdiction over border lands pursuant to Presidential Proclamation 9844 (Feb. 15, 2019).

AMENDMENT NO. 142 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA OF ARIZONA

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Executive Order 13817 (82 Fed. Reg. 60835) with respect to uranium.

AMENDMENT NO. 152 OFFERED BY MR. LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to accept a nomination for oil and gas leasing under 43 CFR 3120.3 et seq, or to offer for oil and gas leasing, any federal lands within the withdrawal area identified on the map of the Chaco Culture National Historical Park prepared by the Bureau of Land Management and dated April 2, 2019.

AMENDMENT NO. 153 OFFERED BY MR. LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

Page 217, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,500,000) (reduced by $1,500,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 155 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 159 OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available to the National Park Service by this Act may be used to increase the generation of water bottle waste.

AMENDMENT NO. 160 OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available to the National Park Service by this Act may be used for the purchase or display of a Confederate flag with the exception of specific circumstances where the flags provide historical context as described in the National Park Service memorandum entitled ''Immediate Action Required, No Reply Needed: Confederate Flags'' and dated June 24, 2015.

AMENDMENT NO. 164 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue a proposed or final rule to replace the Consolidated Federal Oil & Gas and Federal & Indian Coal Valuation Reform final rule, published in the Federal Register on July 1, 2016 (81 FR 43338).

AMENDMENT NO. 169 OFFERED BY MR. VARGAS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 299, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000) (reduced by $10,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 170 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER OF VIRGINIA

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

SEC. ____. No funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled ''Review of Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'' published in the Federal Register by the Environmental Protection Agency on December 20, 2018 (83 Fed. Reg. 65424).

AMENDMENT NO. 171 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER OF VIRGINIA

Page 258, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000) (reduced by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 172 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close or relocate any office of the Environmental Protection Agency that houses emergency responders or a criminal investigation unit.

AMENDMENT NO. 175 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000) (reduced by $25,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 177 OFFERED BY MR. HORSFORD OF NEVADA

Page 234, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 234, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 178 OFFERED BY MR. MCEACHIN OF VIRGINIA

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for a Department of the Interior Executive Resources Board whose voting members are comprised of less than 50 percent career Senior Executive Service members.

AMENDMENT NO. 180 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Page 310, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 310, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 181 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Page 291, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 182 OFFERED BY MR. CASTEN OF ILLINOIS

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act to the United States Geological Survey may be used to limit the use of climate modeling tools.

AMENDMENT NO. 192 OFFERED BY MS. STEVENS OF MICHIGAN

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000) (increased by $2,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 193 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close or relocate any EPA offices in regions that contain one or more designated Sulfur Dioxide (2010) Nonattainment Areas.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, the amendments included in the en bloc were made in order under the rule. I support the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment in the en bloc.

Mr. Chairman, my district is home to Chester, an economically distressed, majority Black city that has struggled for generations. As a result, major polluting industries have set up shop in Chester next to schools, hospitals, homes, and businesses. One of these polluters, a large municipal waste incinerator, was featured on a CNN report that aired just this week.

All day every day my constituents are breathing in carcinogens released by the incinerator like mercury, cadmium, and particulate matter that prevent them from working, learning, and leading healthy lives. At the same time, the Trump administration has failed to enforce Clean Air Act standards that could protect these citizens.

Fortunately, our Interior appropriations bill ensures that Clean Air Act enforcement is a priority, but this amendment makes clear that the administration cannot take these underserved communities like Chester for granted.

This Congress will not allow environmental injustice to go unchecked. We will fight for our constituents, and we will take meaningful steps to address the public health and environmental justice crises that lack of EPA enforcement has fostered.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Democratic en bloc amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment includes language which would take a major step back in unleashing our domestic potential to procure critical minerals and reduce our reliance on foreign competitors like China and Russia. The amendment also includes language which would limit access to the healthiest beverage option in our national parks—water.

Should we limit drinking water options available to park visitors especially in parks where the temperatures can easily reach triple digits?

The answer is no.

Finally, I offer a few observations that I believe we should keep in mind as we discuss ethylene oxide. Ethylene oxide is a critical tool to ensure that medical devices are sterile and safe for patients. For many materials, that is certain plastics, ethylene oxide is the only safe option for sterilization. Other sterilization methods—radiation and steam heat—will degrade the materials and cause the device to lose its integrity.

We all share the goal of patient access to safe medical devices, clean air, and clean workspaces. I am committed to working with my colleague and others to encourage more sustainable and efficient use of EO.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this en bloc amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment which includes an amendment I offered to increase funding for the Environmental Protection Agency's Science Advisory Board to review the strengthening transparency in regulatory science—or so-called secret science—proposed rule and decrease funding for the EPA Administrator's executive management account.

I thank Chair MCCOLLUM for her leadership in increasing funding for the EPA's Science Advisory Board in the underlying bill.

As a cornerstone of its regulatory process, the EPA relies on peer-reviewed science. Unfortunately, the proposed strengthening transparency in regulatory science rule would preclude the use of the best available science. The rule undermines scientific integrity, jeopardizes bedrock public health and environmental standards, and endangers the EPA's ability to fulfill its mission. It would impede, if not eradicate, the agency's work to protect Americans from significant risks to human health and the environment.

Not surprisingly, the EPA ignored science when developing this proposed rule. The EPA failed to consult with their own Office of the Science Advisor, and they limited the Science Advisory Board in the scope of the board's review.

The proposed rule would have chilling consequences for the EPA and for every person who benefits from clean air and clean water. This amendment will direct the Science Advisory Board to provide a comprehensive review of the entire proposed rule before it is finalized. We must defend science.

I, again, thank Chair MCCOLLUM and also Representatives TONKO, SHERRILL, and FLETCHER for their support, and I urge the Congress to support the en bloc amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the en bloc amendment which contains an amendment I have offered.

In order to ensure the Environmental Protection Agency is able to effectively carry out its responsibility to protect human health and the environment for future generations, we need to ensure emergency responders and investigators are there when we need them.

Closing EPA's facilities or relocating personnel tasked with the ultimate responsibility to answer the call during an environmental emergency or investigate the cost and whom to hold accountable in the aftermath is the wrong approach. Future generations will be less safe, and the health of our environment will be at increased risk.

This amendment would simply prevent the EPA from closing or relocating any office or facility that houses either emergency responders or a criminal investigation unit responsible for carrying out the agency's mission.

EPA emergency response personnel serve in offices—some large and some small—across this Nation. These brave and dedicated public servants respond to oil spills; chemical, biological, and radiological releases; and large-scale national emergencies. They also provide additional response assistance when State and local first responder capabilities have been exhausted or need additional support.

Located in my district is the Large Lakes Research Station on Grosse Ile, an island in the Detroit River. This facility serves the Great Lakes region.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment and to offer my environmental justice amendment to H.R. 3055.

This amendment would require that the EPA identify 100 communities across the country that are suffering from especially egregious violations of environmental law and clean them up. It would require the EPA to study what

happens when communities experience multiple sources of pollution and then come up with better ways to protect them going forward. The amendment has one simple goal, to ensure that every American has clean air to breath, safe water to drink, and access to food that is free of toxins.

While the goal may sound simple, the harsh reality is that we as a nation have been failing to provide these staples of life to too many communities for far too long. When we fail to protect our environment, it is often the poorest among us who suffer the most. When we allow pipes to become contaminated or when we allow companies to spew more toxins into the air, it is usually lower income communities and communities of color that get hurt the most. This amendment is for them.

These communities include communities like Elyria Swansea and neighboring Globeville which are neighborhoods in the northern part of my district.

The people in these communities experience a wide range of health problems on a daily basis, like throat irritation and watery eyes, which are likely linked to their constant exposure to a long list of toxins in the air. Whether it is hydrogen cyanide, whether it is other kinds of waste or smog-causing pollutants, these people suffer every day.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to support my amendment and let these communities be remedied.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, apparently there is an individual who is en route who would like to speak on this amendment, but at this point in time I do not have a witness right here, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3055. Ethylene oxide—also known as ETO—is an industrial chemical used to sterilize medical equipment and manufacture products like anti-freeze.

We have known for decades that ETO is dangerous, and in 2016, EPA listed it as a known carcinogen.

Dozens of facilities around the country—including two in my district in—use and emit ETO into the surrounding communities. My constituents in Waukegan and Gurnee are rightly concerned about the local levels of ETO and any possible health consequences.

When our neighbors in Willowbrook, Illinois faced similar questions about ETO, the EPA's community engagement provided vital data to inform residents about the public health risk they face, and the steps they were taking to mitigate the threat.

But the EPA has left dozens of communities around the country, including my constituents, in the dark. These are localities that we know face high ETO levels, yet the EPA refuses to hold public forums to answer our community's urgent questions.

Every American should have confidence in the safety of the air that they and their families breathe. The EPA needs to do its job and engage with communities where that assurance is under threat.

This amendment would set aside $25,000 for EPA public engagement on ethylene oxide to communities identified in the National Air Toxic Assessment to face dangerous emissions levels of this known carcinogen. This is a small sum, but one that would have a big effect on the families living in these communities.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, my amendment would limit the Administration's ability to co-opt important public lands for an unnecessary, hateful, and expensive wall at our Southern border—my home region.

This amendment would defund Section 2 of the President's National Emergency Declaration by barring agencies from using the funds appropriated in this bill to turn parks, wildlife refuges, and other public lands into a militarized border zone administered by agencies lacking the expertise to take good care of them.

Our border lands are comprised of a diverse array of ecosystems that support over 100 different endangered or threatened species, per a 2016 Fish and Wildlife Service report.

The border wall would fragment important habitats, limiting the ability of animals to find food, water, and potential mates across their range.

We always need to be conscientious of the ways that any major federal project affects our natural world. But when the project is so hateful and useless, and when it impacts such vulnerable ecological communities, we must do something.

I refuse to stand by while our President abuses his powers to remove jurisdiction over our public lands from the agencies best able to take care of them. They are our heritage, not an expendable construction zone.

Trump's border wall is unnecessary, harmful and ineffective. Border communities remain some of the safest cities in the country, yet the continued militarization of our borderlands continues hurting border communities, commerce, and wildlife.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is currently exempt from all local, state and federal laws that exist to protect the environment, wildlife, historic and archaeological sites, Native American sacred sites, and religious practices-all of which negatively impact the borderlands.

More walls will not affect the flow of drugs into the country; instead we must modernize and invest in our crumbling infrastructure and ensure adequate staffing at our ports of entry.

I would like to thank the Chair and the committee for their work on this bill. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this amendment, and I would urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

We must stop the false narrative of a violent and insecure border to justify border wall construction.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, my amendment would prevent uranium from being considered as a critical mineral under the Trump Administration's critical mineral strategy.

Last year, the Interior Department included uranium on a list of critical minerals required under Executive Order 13817.

However, uranium does not meet the definition of a "critical mineral" in that executive order.

Under the order, the first criteria for a critical mineral is that it must be a "non-fuel mineral" or a "mineral material."

Uranium is neither.

Even the Department of the Interior understands that.

Earlier this month at a Natural Resources Committee hearing on my Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act, a senior official from the Department testified that, "Uranium, like oil and gas, solar, wind, geothermal, and other energy sources, remains a vital component of a responsible and comprehensive energy strategy."

Clearly, uranium is a fuel mineral, so it fails to meet that part of the critical mineral definition.

And a "mineral material" is defined by the Minerals Act of 1947 as common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, and other similar items.

The Bureau of Land Management also clearly tells people on their website that mineral materials are sold and not subject to the Mining Law of 1872.

Uranium, on the other hand, is subject to the Mining Law of 1872, and it is not a "common variety" of anything by any stretch of the imagination.

So uranium fails that test as well.

We don't even have to get into the fact that our supply chain for uranium comes mainly from friendly countries like Canada and Australia, and is not at risk.

Uranium very clearly does not meet the definition of a "critical mineral" under the executive order.

Yet it is on the list of critical minerals published by the Interior Department last year, and subject to all the production enhancements and incentives recommended by the Department of Commerce in its Critical Mineral Strategy.

We do not need to make it any easier to mine uranium in this country.

Already mining companies in the United States have a sweetheart deal in the form of the Mining Law of 1872, where they pay no royalties and have virtually unfettered access to public lands.

The administration has already taken unprecedented steps that help out the uranium industry, such as cutting Bears Ears National Monument by 85 percent at their request.

Now the new critical mineral strategy recommends reviewing existing mineral withdrawals with an eye towards eliminating or shrinking them, particularly in areas where they may be critical minerals.

Because uranium is incorrectly defined as a critical mineral, this puts the Grand Canyon right in the crosshairs.

The Obama administration put a 20-year withdrawal on the sensitive lands around the Grand Canyon so it could study the impacts of uranium mining in the region.

We are less than half of the way into that withdrawal, but the uranium companies are salivating at the possibility of ending those protections early and descending on uranium deposits around the Grand Canyon.

My Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act would protect this landscape and the residents who have called it home for centuries. Unfortunately, we may never get the chance to do this if President Trump continues to do the bidding of the uranium mining companies.

Given the legacy of uranium mining in the West, particularly the terrible health impacts experienced on the Navajo Nation from abandoned uranium mines, we should be holding

mining companies accountable, not handing them a blank check to more of our most special public lands.

That's why this amendment is so important.

It prohibits the administration from treating uranium as a critical mineral and using the actions identified in the Commerce Department's Critical Mineral Strategy in order to grease the skids for new uranium mines.

It doesn't affect any of the other minerals on the critical minerals list, and it doesn't prevent companies from staking new uranium claims or opening new uranium mines.

It just keeps the government from giving those companies any additional benefits beyond the too many that they already have.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 127 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

AMENDMENT NO. 128 OFFERED BY MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 128 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and gas leasing, preleasing, or related activities in the Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas for the South Atlantic, the Straits of Florida, and the areas of the Central and Eastern Gulf of Mexico described by section 104(a) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–432).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to protect the coastlines of Florida from the scourge of offshore oil drilling.

I am proud to say that this amendment, as we will see this morning from my colleagues' comments, has strong bipartisan support from our colleagues in the Florida delegation.

When it comes to the idea of turning our beaches into a fossil fuel industrial zone, there is no divergence between Democrats and Republicans in Florida. We stand united to prevent drilling off of our cherished coasts. Florida's famous beaches are central to our $65 billion a year tourism industry. Our hotels, fishermen, and recreation industries depend on clean coastal waters, and the still recovering Florida Bay cannot afford an oil spill.

Every time I speak about this issue, I make sure to mention the Deepwater Horizon disaster. Apparently, the current administration has already forgotten what happened to us 9 years ago. At its worst, the spill leaked more than 60,000 barrels of oil a day. Eighty-seven days went by while crude gushed into the ocean nearly unchecked. By its end, millions of barrels of crude oil were released into the Gulf of Mexico.

This devastated the entire Gulf ecosystem. Thousands of protected species were harmed by oil slicks and dead zones. Coral reefs between Alabama and Florida were decimated and suffocated by oil, and hydrocarbons were found on hundreds of miles of beaches around the Gulf.

This environmental impact also left a human toll. The accident caused the deaths of 11 rig workers. The spill left 12,000 people unemployed and decimated local economies which rely on fishing and marine recreation.

□ 1315

Now is not the time to expand more areas to fossil fuel extraction. We must be doing everything possible to transition to a clean energy economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST), my friend and the former Governor of our great State.

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Florida, Representative DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for her leadership on this important issue and for working with me and the Florida delegation to include banning drilling in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico in this amendment.

I represent most of Pinellas County, Florida, on the Gulf Coast. My district is surrounded by water on three sides. It is virtually a peninsula. As you can imagine, this issue is deeply important to me, my constituents, and all Floridians.

I was Governor of Florida when the Deepwater Horizon exploded in 2010. I saw the tar balls wash up along Florida beaches. I saw the harm done to Florida's economy and our way of life. I have seen firsthand the consequences of offshore oil drilling. I hope to never see it again.

We must protect the eastern Gulf of Mexico and the environmental, economic, and national security benefits it provides to the region and to the United States of America. I could not be more proud that the Florida delegation stands united to do exactly that.

I urge passage of this amendment and the underlying legislation.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, if I might inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from southwest Florida (Mr. ROONEY), who represents the great counties of Collier and Lee.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from the east coast of Florida, Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for her courageous leadership on this issue and join and echo what the Governor said as we continue to work together to fight the scourge of offshore drilling.

Offshore drilling anywhere near Florida represents an existential threat to our tourist and recreation economy that we cannot risk taking.

We also have the important military bases all along the Gulf Coast that the Governor referred to that are equally important that use the Gulf as offshore testing grounds. This is the only place in the world where our United States Navy and Air Force can conduct these tests.

I want to thank Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her leadership and to urge adoption of this amendment and protect Florida. Twenty-one million people are being protected by Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, before I yield the remaining time to Mr. RUTHERFORD from Jacksonville, I include in the RECORD this letter from the Florida delegation opposing offshore oil drilling that was sent to Secretary Bernhardt.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2019.

Re Protect Florida's Coasts from Oil and Gas Drilling.

DAVID BERNHARDT,
Acting Secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

DEAR ACTING INTERIOR SECRETARY BERNHARDT: We write to urge you to protect the coasts of Florida from oil and gas development. As you know, last year, former Interior Secretary Zinke announced that Florida would be exempt from any offshore drilling plans. However, we remain concerned that no formal action has been taken to prohibit drilling off Florida's coasts. Florida's natural resources and economy, as well as the military mission as expressed by the Department of Defense, cannot bear the risk and devastating impacts of offshore drilling. We urge you to take formal action to exempt drilling off Florida's coast from the five year plan for oil and gas lease sales.

Florida's economic well-being is dependent upon our state's fragile and treasured coasts. Clean coasts and healthy oceans are the fundamental underpinning of jobs and revenue in our communities. Florida's coastal communities thrive in concert with a healthy marine environment. Views littered with drilling platforms, industrialization of coastline and oil on our beaches spell disaster for Florida's economy and our neighbors who rely on tourism, fishing and related business.

We saw, firsthand, the destruction offshore drilling can have on ocean health, coastlines, and tourism in 2010 during the Deepwater Horizon disaster. Tourism dropped across the state, including areas that were unaffected by the rig explosion. Even without a blowout, offshore oil rigs dump tons of drilling muds, fluids, and metal cuttings—including toxic metals and carcinogens—into the ocean, and pose a threat to human health, marine ecosystems, and wildlife.

While there are ample environmental and economic reasons to prohibit drilling off Florida's coasts, our national security and military readiness also require keeping the rigs away from Florida. The eastern Gulf of Mexico is a critical training area for our military and the Department of Defense has

stated clearly that the area is an ''irreplaceable national asset'' for combat force readiness. Any oil and gas development would be an obstacle to military preparedness and national security.

Finally, the people of Florida are also clearly opposed to oil and gas development off our coast. A constitutional amendment on Florida's November 2018 ballot to ban offshore drilling in state waters passed overwhelmingly. Here is objective proof that Floridians recognize that the state's economy depends on a pristine environment, and that offshore drilling threatens Florida's future.

Florida relies on coastlines unencumbered by oil and gas drilling to sustain its economy, preserve its natural resources, and protect our nation's military. We urge you to exempt Florida's coasts from any offshore drilling plans. We must preserve and protect Florida's future.

Sincerely,

Kathy Castor, Member of Congress; Frederica S. Wilson, Member of Congress; Donna E. Shalala, Member of Congress; Bill Posey, Member of Congress; Francis Rooney, Member of Congress; Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Member of Congress; Charlie Crist, Member of Congress; Matt Gaetz, Member of Congress; Ted S. Yoho, D.V.M., Member of Congress; Alcee L. Hastings, Member of Congress; Gus M. Bilirakis, Member of Congress; Brian J. Mast, Member of Congress; Stephanie Murphy, Member of Congress; Theodore E. Deutch, Member of Congress; Daniel Webster, Member of Congress; Mario Diaz-Balart, Member of Congress; Debbie Mucarsel-Powell, Member of Congress; Al Lawson, Jr, Member of Congress; Lois Frankel, Member of Congress; Darren Soto, Member of Congress; Val Butler Demings, Member of Congress; John H. Rutherford, Member of Congress; Vern Buchanan, Member of Congress; W. Gregery Steube, Member of Congress; Neal P. Dunn, M.D., Member of Congress; Michael Waltz, Member of Congress; Ross Spano, Member of Congress.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Jacksonville, Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from south Florida for, as was mentioned earlier, having the courage to stand up for our State and protect it from the scourge of drilling.

I have to tell you, just last November, Mr. Chair, 69 percent of Florida voters supported banning drilling in the State waters off of Florida's coast.

It is no secret that our Florida beaches and our oceans drive our economy. Drilling could affect not only our beautiful beaches and thriving tourism but, also, our national security.

I have met with Department of Defense officials multiple times, and they have continued to share serious concerns about how offshore drilling activities could impact their operations.

The eastern Gulf is a vital training ground for our military, and on Florida's Atlantic Coast that I share with my colleague, we are home to Mayport, NAS Jax, and Kings Bay, just to name a few.

Mr. Chair, this important amendment will protect our coast, our economies, and our national defense. For all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this because I want to remind everybody this is continental offshore; this is not State-owned property. This is the property of the American public.

So, if we are going to extend that aspect, I want the same type of application to lands out in western Arizona and the Western United States. So we have to start looking at this.

We have seen opposition, basically, state that they can't coexist: fundamental energy development, exploration, and tourism. But we see that very vibrantly in the Gulf State of Louisiana. We see one of the most vibrant fishing areas. The argument doesn't hold muster in that regard.

In regards to that, we need to explore and find out exactly what kind of resources are actually there. It makes a big difference in regards to energy independence because those who spend money for tourism have to have a job, and plentiful energy at affordable prices help American businesses and the American worker.

So the same aspects we are trying to extend here for Florida should be extended all the way across the board.

But, once again, this is the public's property. It needs to be well invested, and the government has the due diligence in which to do that.

We can take into consideration the concerns of the military. We do it time and time again in southwestern Arizona. We have the Goldwater Range, the Yuma Proving Ground, yet we still coexist with the natural resources and environmental protections.

I think, within that aspect, I rise in opposition, and I would ask everybody to defeat this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 129 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement or enforce the regulation issued on March 21, 2011 at 40 CFR part 60 subparts CCCC and DDDD with respect to ''small, remote incinerators'' in the State of Alaska.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

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

(Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, in 2013, the EPA issued new standards on air pollutant emissions for commercial and industrial solid waste incineration, which include the small, remote incinerators used in remote Alaska.

My amendment would prohibit the EPA from enforcing these rules on small, remote incinerators in Alaska. My amendment would not affect anyone but Alaskans.

I know this Chamber has shown great interest in my State recently, but I sincerely hope you would agree that enforcing these rules in remote locations that are not even connected with the highway system is unjustified.

While I appreciate the focus on clean air, these standards are unattainable for rural Alaska. If the 2013 criteria are enforced in my State, residents and industry alike would be forced to be noncompliant or would not be able to use waste incinerators at all.

In many locations, there are very limited options for the handling and disposal of waste. The ground is frozen or the water table is too high. The locations that would be impacted by this rule are hundreds of miles away from waste facilities in Anchorage, Juneau, and Fairbanks.

While garbage trucks are critical to the infrastructure of the lower 48, transporting waste from these remote sites would generate more emissions than burning near the sites.

When EPA wrote this rule, they used bad science and statistical methods to select the new standards. They didn't use enough samples to have statistical confidence in the values, and two of the incinerator units they used in the emission data do not even qualify as ''small'' or ''remote'' areas. They were both located within 20 miles of a regional landfill.

Incineration is the cleanest, most environmentally sustainable way to deal with waste in small villages. One thousand pounds of waste can be reduced to 50 pounds of ash that can be safely transported.

Keep this in mind: We have a lot of small villages that can only have incinerators; they cannot have landfills without shipping it. I am talking about 400 or 500 people.

This is not a good idea. It is the wrong thing to do.

I will say again, Alaska is a little unique. We are just about half as big as the United States, with 750,000 people. To put this standard in place, making these people, frankly, break the law is wrong. This amendment would keep them from applying that to the standards.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment would exempt certain small incinerators in Alaska from being regulated under the Clean Air Act.

My good friend knows that this amendment is fundamentally different from what was done in the 2019 bill. That language barred incinerator rules adopted in 2011 from being enforced but left in place the pre-2011 rules governing those facilities.

This amendment would bar enforcement of any Clean Air Act rule, and, for me, that is unacceptable.

These incinerators, as the gentleman pointed out, are currently burning, but what they are releasing is some of the most noxious air emissions in the country, some of the most grievous.

It is critical that we ensure that we are complying with clean air regulations. There have to be some rules to this.

We have an obligation to protect the health and safety of all Americans, and exempting incinerators in the way that this language is currently written, for even small and remote ones, from the Clean Air Act regulations is just something I can't accept at this time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments, but, again, what do you do with a town that has 500 people and the only way to dispose of waste is by burning it or letting it go on the turf, letting it blow around, letting it pollute the other parts of the Earth? This is the only sensible way to do it.

I am not talking about great big cities. I am talking about small communities that cannot have landfills. And that does occur.

We don't have that many in Alaska, but where they do have these incinerators, there ought to be some compliance in the sense that: Okay, guys, you are not really polluting the air. It is a better way. There is more environmental damage by not being able to bury it, letting it run around on the top of the surface of the Earth, than there is burning it.

I know I just came out of Denmark. They have one of the largest incinerators in the world. It handles 2 million people. They burn 35 tons an hour.

Now, I am saying, okay, let's have those kind of incinerators, but you can't afford it for a small village.

Mr. Chair, I know where the gentlewoman is coming from, but you can't apply all rules to every place at one time when it doesn't work. You have to look at the total environmental damage.

I think, if you don't burn it, you have a lot harder problem than you do if you do burn it, so I urge my colleagues to support this small, innocuous amendment to try to make people live a better way than having them forced by a government agency to a standard that can't be met unless they just let it run around on the top of the ground.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as I said, I understand the gentleman's concerns, but the fact is that this is fundamentally different from what we did in the FY20 bill in working with the lead Senator from Alaska, who is the counterpart on the Interior appropriations.

This just goes too far. So, I oppose this as it is currently written, and I can't go just supporting this, because it completely, completely eliminates the Clean Air Act rules.

I offer the gentleman an opportunity to go in front of the authorizing committee, and, at that point, if he wants to talk some more and we can figure out a way to create a win-win, I would be happy to help him in the authorizing committee; but I cannot support this amendment as it stands, eliminating the rules for clean air, at this time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendments No. 130 and 131 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 132 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 132 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior to conduct oil and gas leasing, preleasing, or related activities in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, or the South Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1330

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to block oil and gas drilling in the Atlantic Ocean. My amendment is steeped in bipartisan tradition. For 27 years, starting in 1982, Congress continuously supported an Atlantic oil and gas drilling moratorium.

We cannot take the greatest resource of our coastal communities and economies for granted, which is why, today, we must act to restore the bipartisan language that would protect the Atlantic Coast from drilling.

The Trump administration's misguided effort to drill in the Atlantic is reckless, in my opinion. Simply put, the vitality of our coastal economies is tied to healthy ocean ecosystems. Healthy oceans along the East Coast support billions in gross domestic product and more than a million jobs through fishing, recreation, and tourism alone.

In my home State of New Jersey, the tourism industry generates $44 billion a year and supports over half a million jobs. This will no longer be the case if the beautiful beaches of the Jersey shore are slicked with oil.

The bipartisan cosponsors of this amendment and the communities we represent are unwilling to accept the tremendous risks that come with oil and gas drilling in the Atlantic. Hundreds of local governments have passed formal resolutions opposing oil and gas exploration and drilling in the Atlantic, as have numerous local chambers of commerce, tourism and restaurant associations, and commercial and recreational fishing associations.

More than 43,000 businesses and 500,000 commercial fishing families have joined together to strongly oppose offshore oil and gas exploration and drilling.

Mr. Chair, ocean health is already strained by too much trash, rising sea temperatures, and acidification due to climate change. Our oceans and our economies can't afford the risks of dangerous oil and gas development.

More than 4 million gallons of oil have been spilled or leaked in the Pacific Ocean since 1969. Again, the unimaginable risk to our shores is not worth making wealthy oil and gas companies richer.

In 2010, the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster caused a 10-year projected economic loss of $8.7 billion in fisheries from Texas to Florida, including 22,000 lost jobs.

There is no hiding behind State lines from oil spills. The only way to protect ourselves is a full Atlantic moratorium and a commonsense return to historic bipartisan precedent.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. This amendment I am speaking in opposition to is actually shortsighted.

We have been producing oil and gas offshore all over the country on the Outer Continental Shelf for a very long time. We can do it safely.

I believe the ones who don't want to see the areas mentioned in this amendment opened up for offshore leasing really just don't want fossil fuel development.

We are in an energy renaissance in this country where we are finding more oil and gas, to the point that we are now a net exporter of oil and a net exporter of gas. That means we are producing more in this country than we are using in this country, so we have a surplus. We are able to help our friends and allies around the world, in Europe, to lessen their dependence on Russian gas.

Shutting down the opportunity to explore on the Outer Continental Shelf in these areas is really not wanting to find out what is out there. What harm does it do to look, to begin the seismic work, to find out what may be off the coast of the great State of South Carolina?

Recently, they just found, off the coast of Suriname and Guyana, 32 trillion cubic feet of natural gas by using 21st-century, 3D seismic technology. If we allowed the seismic work to happen in these areas that y'all are wanting to exclude from energy exploration, we might find 32 trillion, 50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Then the Southeast is playing in the energy renaissance in this country.

I think this is shortsighted. What harm does it do to look, to allow these areas to be opened for exploration and then, ultimately, production to help meet the energy needs of this Nation and others around the world going forward?

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

I appreciate the comments that the gentleman from South Carolina made. I don't mean to speak for his State, but I have to say, I was in Savannah and then went for a couple of days over to Saint Helena island, Hilton Head, and some of the areas where the Gullah people are. On another occasion, in May, I was in Charleston, and I went to James Island and a few other places.

I find it very hard to believe that the people who live in those coastal areas don't share the same concerns that we have in New Jersey about the impact of an oil spill on our tourism and recreational fishing industry.

Again, I am not going to speak for the gentleman's State because that wouldn't be proper.

But let me say this: When my colleague on the other side says that we can drill safely, I have to disagree.

When we had the BP spill 9 years ago, there was a bipartisan commission that was set up, and they made certain recommendations about drilling. Those recommendations were not followed by the Republican leadership in Congress.

The fact of the matter is that the BP spill was in relatively shallow water, compared to the type of drilling that is proposed off the coast of the Atlantic. What is happening is that, as we go further and further off the Outer Continental Shelf, the possibility of spills and the inability to take proper safety precautions become even more of a problem.

That was what the BP commission recommended. They pointed out that as we go deeper out, the technology doesn't exist to protect the coastal areas from a spill.

So I have to take issue with the gentleman. I would point out that the recommendations of the BP commission were never met.

I ask my colleagues to stand united by voting in favor of protecting the health and economic vitality of the coastal communities of all 14 States along the Atlantic Coast and the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I have seen, in the Natural Resources Committee, when I was there years ago, where fear tactics were used, saying that whales and other sea mammals, dolphins, would be killed because of the seismic work.

We had the chief biologist from BOEM say not a single marine mammal has ever been harmed in the exploration and seismic work that we have done all over the globe, off the coast of the Falklands, in the Mediterranean, off the coast of Africa. These fear tactics of oil spills and things are just shortsighted on meeting our energy needs, and the gentleman from Arizona gets that.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, the irony of this aspect, to explore something that is of the public nature of the people of the United States, the ironic aspect is unfathomable.

To look at seismic, we don't even want to do seismic. We need seismic in regard to looking at moorings in regard to big wind. That is what we have seen over and over again, that this area wants to have big wind.

The other part to this aspect is, how does that work when you have to have a Russian tanker moored outside of your bay, which is one of the most easily spilled aspects of oil that you have to have for heating oil and natural gas in regard to heating your energy platforms in the areas? That is just unfathomable to me.

We do this better, and the technology is actually coming back around.

As the Western Caucus chairman, we went down to Houston to actually see the technology that exists. It is profound, absolutely profound what is there.

No one is asking to go past go, collect $200. What they want to do is follow the rightful process in that aspect.

There is evidence like I cited in the Gulf States. Definitely when you look at Louisiana, it is a plethora. It is one of the most diverse aquatic ecosystems around.

There is a way to have this and looking at it and benefit everybody.

Once again, the dichotomy of trying to separate one aspect of holdings for the American people, and then apply it to out West, where there is even more defined aspects of jurisdiction, to land aspects of public lands and public minerals and gas leases, is just ironic.

Mr. Chair, I remain in opposition.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I would urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment because I think it is shortsighted. There are States that want to play in the energy matrix. They want to play in the renaissance. They want to, hopefully, experience a 37.5 percent revenue-sharing back to the State.

Hopefully, they can experience the jobs that are created in the oil and gas industry that is an economic boom, not only for the State coffers through tax revenue but also with the jobs that are created in those communities.

Mr. Chair, I would urge my colleagues to defeat 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 New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 133 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 133 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue a permit for the import of a sport-hunted trophy of an elephant or lion taken in Tanzania, Zimbabwe, or Zambia. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment. For my constituents and my area, it is very important to them.

The amendment would prohibit permits for hunting and killing endangered lions and elephants for trophies in various countries in Africa—Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Tanzania.

Both the African elephant and lion are endangered species on the verge of extinction. We have seen lion populations decline by 50 percent in the past decade. In Tanzania, the elephant population declined by 60 percent between 2009 and 2014.

This amendment is critical to help ensure these creatures do not become extinct. President Trump has called elephant hunting a ''horror show.''

There is no scientific evidence to support the claim that trophy hunting aids in helping to manage the population of these animals. If this were the case, we would see an increase in the species, not a dramatic decline of the elephant and lion populations.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Sport hunting is an important recreational activity for countless Americans and has been for centuries. President Teddy Roosevelt, a champion of the conservation movement, went on hunting expeditions around the world.

This amendment would negatively impact the people of Zimbabwe, Zambia, and Tanzania. The money generated from trophy hunts helps the local populations by providing jobs and funding for community services.

One of the countries listed in the amendment is Zimbabwe. The Communal Areas Management Plan for Indigenous Resources, or CAMPFIRE, program in Zimbabwe attempted to create economic incentives for communities and landowners to conduct habitat and ecosystem restoration. At one point, CAMPFIRE generated more than $20 million, of which almost 90 percent came from trophy hunting, allowing communities to establish management over the habit and resources within the range area.

Another country mentioned in the amendment is Zambia. Zambia's Administrative Design for Game Management Areas program has served as a model for locally accruing trophy-hunting revenue, as the program receives 67 percent of the trophy-hunting revenue in game management areas. Fifty-three percent of the program revenue is directed toward wildlife management. The remainder goes to community development.

There is also a lack of sufficient data on the effect of hunting species that would lead us to support efforts like this amendment. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, many scientific studies on trophy hunting's effects on wildlife populations contain disclaimers of insufficient data to measure the effect of hunting on a species.

Certainly, improvements can be made in these and other countries to further conserve species and benefit local communities. However, this amendment would take us in the wrong direction. Instead, we should focus our efforts on habitat loss and fragmentation, illegal poaching, and conflict with humans.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my co-chair of the Congressional Animal Protection Caucus.

□ 1345

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I appreciate his leadership on this.

Sadly, invoking the memory of Teddy Roosevelt is not exactly the best symbol of conservation. He was one of the people that slaughtered thousands of buffalo and had trophy hunting around the world.

What is different today is that the scale is much greater, the populations we want to protect are dwindling.

At one point, we thought there was an inexhaustible supply of wild animals to kill. Even Teddy Roosevelt ended up supporting legislation to be able to protect endangered species, which he did in terms of the slaughter of wild birds.

We have seen these populations drop dramatically.

What trophy hunters do, they kill the strongest, the most magnificent animals, that if they are left in the population, would promote stronger herds of elephants and lions.

We are working against ourselves.

For a while here, the Federal Government took steps to limit the issuance of these permits, which as my friend Mr. BUCHANAN points out, even Donald Trump says is a horror show.

Now, I have been in Tanzania recently and looked at what happened on the ground. If you talk to those people there, their future is not slaughtering wildlife, it is protecting it.

The photo expeditions where they take the pictures and they don't kill them, that they reuse over and over and over again, is far more valuable and doesn't hurt the species.

Mr. Chair, I would respectfully request that we approve the gentleman's amendment, that we stop this barbaric practice, that we not undermine the protection of these species, and do everything we can to reverse the horrific condition they have faced over the course of the last 20 years.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the chairwoman of the subcommittee.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, we should not be facilitating the hunting of species in countries that do not have good domestic conservation programs and have not demonstrated established, sound, science-based management programs.

The Interior bill recognizes the importance of these iconic species and the role they play in the ecosystem. It is imperative to conserve these species, especially in light of the recent UN report on biodiversity that warns us that 1 million species face extinction.

This amendment supports the committee's efforts to ensure the survival of elephants and lions for future and present generations. I support the amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), my distinguished colleague.

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

The misinformation you have just heard on the floor: You are not going to save any animals, you are going to help kill animals.

I have been to Africa eight times. I have tried to conserve, and I have done so. Areas that I have been hunting, like Namibia, the loss of the animals is because of poaching, not for the ivory, but because of the food, because there is no value to the animal, so they will kill it and eat it, the local people.

You are not going to help it out, because there is no value to that animal other than food if you don't have trophy hunting when it is worth more.

If I was to kill a buffalo over there, all I get is the head and the hide. They get the meat.

All you are going to do is prohibit it being imported into the United States and making you feel good, but it is not going to save the animal. In fact, the animal is going to diminish. That has been proven regardless of what you may read.

We are the real conservationists. It is going to let everybody else around the world go hunt in those areas, probably without any safeguard or investment.

This may sound good, it may help somebody out in their district, but it is not going to save the animals.

I suggest, respectfully, you ought to go and witness what is occurring over there by those that live there and are destroying the animals if we do not hunt them, because there is no value.

I believe I am a great conservationist. I have probably saved more animals than anyone in the room, because I do contribute.

You don't. You talk.

I think it is a shameful thing to say we are going to tell another country what they can and cannot do. That is what you are doing to make yourself feel good, but you are not saving the animals.

A conservationist is a true man that conserves, not tries to preserve in the natural state, because the natural state is very cruel. It takes the weak, it takes the strong, it takes them all. Man is the strongest of all, and they will take them all if it has no value other than food.

So I urge the defeat of this amendment. I wish more people would go and look and see, because you don't know what you are talking about.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the immediate past chairman of the Congressional Sportsman's Caucus, the largest bipartisan caucus in the United States Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, and I agree with what the gentleman from Alaska just said.

Hunters have conserved more acres and protected more animals all across the globe than many in this Chamber.

I realize we are an urban Nation, that we are having more representation from urban areas and we have gotten away from our days of hunting and fishing and understanding the role that the hunter plays in conservation, but, as the gentleman from Alaska said, we are going to tell other countries that they can't allow hunting because we are going to shut off the ability of the American hunter to bring certain trophies back.

These folks live with 5-ton animals that are damaging their crops, a whole season's worth of crops in one single night. Elephants are dangerous.

Ultimately, if you take the hunter out of that situation, the hunter is paying with his hard-earned dollars, not your tax dollars, his money.

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

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM OF MINNESOTA

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 445, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 5 consisting of amendment Nos. 134, 137, 145, 146, 149, 150, 154, 157, 162, 166, 173, 174, 179, 183, 184, 185, 186, 188, 189, and 191 printed in part B of House Report 116–119, offered by Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota:

AMENDMENT NO. 134 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

Page 232, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 137 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT OF ARIZONA

Page 258, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 145 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 311, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1) (increased by $1)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 146 OFFERED BY MS. MATSUI OF CALIFORNIA

Page 293, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000) (reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 301, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000) (reduced by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 149 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 302, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000) (increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 150 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 258, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 322, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 154 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 310, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)(increased by $10,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 157 OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 258, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 267, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 162 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Page 310, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000) (reduced by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 166 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ OF CALIFORNIA

Page 309, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000) (decreased by $2,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 173 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

Page 224, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000)''.

Page 224, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $200,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 174 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Page 301, line 8, insert '', or any territory or possession of the United States'' before the semicolon.

AMENDMENT NO. 179 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Page 327, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,000,000)''.

Page 327, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 183 OFFERED BY MR. CASTEN OF ILLINOIS

Page 289, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1) (increased by $1)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 184 OFFERED BY MS. CRAIG OF MINNESOTA

Page 302, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000) (reduced by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 185 OFFERED BY MS. HAALAND OF NEW MEXICO

Page 322, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $35,000,000) (reduced by $35,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 186 OFFERED BY MS. HAALAND OF NEW MEXICO

Page 246, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $176,000,000) (reduced by $176,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 188 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

Page 302, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000) (increased by $10,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 189 OFFERED BY MR. MCADAMS OF UTAH

Page 267, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1) (increased by $1)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 191 OFFERED BY MS. SHERRILL OF NEW JERSEY

Page 288, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $8,000,000) (increased by $8,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the amendments included in the en bloc have been made in order by the rule and have been agreed to by both sides.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendments and urge their adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I rise to support the en bloc amendment.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman LOWEY for her support and Chair MCCOLLUM for working with us to include provisions important to Members on both sides of the aisle.

Included in this en bloc amendment are several water provisions that I support, including grants to States to reduce pollution in our waterways.

The amendment also supports the maintenance of the Great Lakes Advisory Board, which helps to ensure that transparent and credible views guide Great Lakes Restoration Initiative investments.

Finally, the en bloc amendment includes language prioritizing funding for grants to fight domestic violence in American Indian and Alaska Native communities.

Mr. Chair, I support the bipartisan en bloc amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Chair, the Great Lakes Advisory Board plays an essential role in providing the EPA with the technical, environmental, and local expertise needed to carry out the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

This board is one of over 1,000 advisory boards that operate across the Federal Government.

This past Friday, the Trump administration put all of those boards at risk by signing an executive order eliminating one-third of Federal advisory boards.

These boards provide technical expertise on topics as diverse as animal health, safe pesticide use, trade, and offer useful third-party review of scientific research conducted at Federal agencies.

The Trump administration order is, in a word, arbitrary, and it presents a clear threat to the ability of agencies to have the best information when making fundamental and far-reaching decisions.

While my amendment is specific to the Great Lakes Advisory Board, I have offered this amendment to underscore the importance of preserving funding for all of these boards.

The executive order is a mistake. It is another stunning escalation in this administration's war on science, and the American people deserve better.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), my distinguished colleague and friend.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also want to thank Chairwoman MCCOLLUM and Ranking Member JOYCE for working with me on this very important amendment.

In North Carolina's Eighth Congressional District, we are fortunate to have the Uwharrie National Forest. Throughout my time in Congress, I have heard horror stories from my constituents of the danger of the public roads within the Uwharrie National Forest.

I have seen these roads firsthand and can testify to the critical need of paving these roads.

My amendment works towards improving and maintaining these roads and assuring public access to this State treasure.

One of my constituents had a heart attack, and the ambulance couldn't get down the road because of the ruts and the washouts. Thankfully, the desperate, resourceful paramedics got out of the ambulance and sprinted down the road with a stretcher.

Another one of my constituents, their house burned to the ground because the road was so impassable, a firetruck couldn't get down to put out the blaze.

These are just a few of the examples of the severe public safety concerns that my constituents are facing due to the inability of the Park Service to maintain these roads.

It is unacceptable, and it is one reason why I have worked so hard to advocate on behalf of Uwharrie National Forest and advocate for more resources for the Park Service in general.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank the Chief of the Forest Service, Ms. Christiansen, for her attention to this issue and for working with me to address this public safety crisis.

In addition, Mr. Chair, I want to, again, thank Chairwoman MCCOLLUM for her work to increase funding for road construction in this legislation.

I will continue to work and stress the urgency of this issue until my constituents are safe. It is my duty as a Congressman to get this done.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment as well as the en bloc.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), another Great Lakes State.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairwoman MCCOLLUM for her leadership in bringing forward a proposal that protects and preserves public lands, ensures access to clean air and drinking water, and combats climate change.

I am especially pleased to see this bill's $90 million investment for the first time in Sewer Overflow Control Grants to control and treat sewer overflows and to help address the water infrastructure crisis our country faces.

My amendment prioritizes grant funding from Macomb County's Chapaton Retention Basin and other such sewer overflow systems that help protect the water sources our communities rely on every day. This funding will help make urgent water quality improvements to Lake St. Clair, to the Great Lakes, and to freshwater bodies all across our country.

Mr. Chair, I would also like to thank the former distinguished Member of this body and the current Macomb County Public Works Commissioner, Candice Miller, for her partnership to make sure we protect Lake St. Clair.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 1400

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her leadership, and I want to thank the Appropriations Committee, and this one in particular, for the great work that the committee is doing.

I have had the privilege of doing amendments under the CJS, Agriculture, Interior, and let me express my appreciation for the added $2 million for research in Historically Black Colleges, and particularly the opportunity for my amendment to enable NIFA to increase funding by $2 million to the 1890 institutions, which are 19 HBCU land grants to support educational research.

It is so very important as it relates to food and agriculture, in particular, to make an increase so that the 1890 institutions can again be at the forefront of research. One of the schools in my area, Prairie View A&M, and Texas Southern University prepare the leaders for the agriculture industry of the future. So this legislation provides support for the many schools, such as Alabama A&M, Alcorn State University, Prairie View A&M, Fort Valley State University, Kentucky State University; and, of course, they enroll 40 percent of all African American students.

So I am grateful for this amendment, and I ask my colleagues to support the underlying bill.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Chair's En Bloc Amendment, which includes Jackson Lee Amendment No. 91.

I wish to thank Chairman MCGOVERN and Ranking Member COLE of the Rules Committee for making this Jackson Lee Amendment in order.

I thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member FORTENBERRY for their hard work in bringing Division B, the Agriculture and Related Agencies portion of this omnibus appropriations legislative package, to the floor.

Thank you for this opportunity to briefly explain my amendment.

The Jackson Lee amendment supports the work of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) by making a modest increase in funding to that office for the purpose of supporting agriculture research programs at 1890s Institutions, which are land grant colleges at 19 Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

NIFA works to improve our nation's food production through agricultural research, economic analysis, extension, and higher education.

The NIFA was created at the time of the industrial revolution to ensure that the nation would have a sufficient number of working farms to provide a reliable supply of domestically produced food.

One of ways NIFA achieves its mission is by providing research grants to education institutions, which include 1890s institutions created by the Morrill Act of 1890.

Today, land-grant colleges and universities can be found in 18 states, the District of Columbia and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The list includes:

Alabama A&M University
Alcorn State University
Delaware State University
Florida A&M University
Fort Valley State University
Kentucky State University
Langston University
Lincoln University
North Carolina A&T State University
Prairie View A&M University in Texas
South Carolina State University
Southern University System
Tennessee State University
Tuskegee University
University of Arkansas Pine Bluff
University of Maryland Eastern Shore
University of the District of Columbia
University of the Virgin Islands
Virginia State University
West Virginia State University

HBCUs annually enroll 40 percent of all African American students in 4-year colleges and universities.

HBCUs are prominent among research institutions in fields such as:

animal sciences
sustainable agriculture and agriculture economics
toxicology and waste management
conservation and environmental management
business and industrial development
biomedical science
food and nutrition
plant and social sciences
international development

The demand for fresh fruits and vegetables as well as concerns for the distance food travels before they reach the tables in urban areas has led to the rise of urban farming.

HBCU agriculture research institutions are playing a significant role in bringing urban farming to communities of color.

HCBU's agricultural research programs also assist people living in densely populated areas to learn ways to eliminate food deserts, increase public education regarding farming, develop a greater appreciation for our nation's farmers, and provide new avenues for careers for those graduating with agriculture degrees seeking to inter into cutting edge agricultural research.

The funds provided by the Jackson Lee amendment would support research and education into means for helping urban and suburban communities maximize their green space by turning it into productive farming resources to support access to affordable foods.

The funding can also help to develop new research efforts directed at farming techniques for non-traditional farming space, such as those we are now seeing being developed for urban centers.

Adoption of the Jackson Lee Amendment will benefit rural, suburban and urban areas by maximizing the potential for farming activity in areas where green space is limited, or land is underused.

I urge support of the Jackson Lee Amendment and thank Chairman BISHOP and his colleagues on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee for their work on this important legislation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3055, which would provide funding for the 400 Years of African-American History Commission. I would like to thank my colleagues, Representatives JOHN LEWIS, BARBARA LEE, and RASHIDA TLAIB for cosponsoring this amendment which would provide an additional $500,000 to support the work of this important commission. I would also like to thank Chairwoman LOWEY, Chairwoman MCCOLLUM and the Appropriations Committee for working with me to include funding in the underlying bill and their support for this amendment.

The 400 Years of African American History Commission is charged with planning programs and activities to commemorate the arrival of the ''twenty and odd'' enslaved Africans who arrived at Point Comfort, Virginia 400 years ago this August and to recognize the influence and contributions of Africans in America in the 400 years since.

Unfortunately, that August day in 1619 was not the last time men, women, and children arrived to our country as slaves or were born into bondage here. The history of our nation cannot be fully understood or appreciated without knowing and acknowledging their stories and understanding the ramifications of slavery. We must not ever allow ourselves to forget that this country, including our nation's Capitol, was built through the forced labor of enslaved Africans and their descendents.

More than a stain on our nation's past, racism in America did not end with emancipation nor the end of Jim Crow. We must recognize how it continues to impact our communities and our nation today as we address issues of environmental justice, voting rights, mass incarceration, police brutality, and inequity in education and housing. Only then can we begin to move forward together as a country.

In the past 400 years, African Americans have struggled and triumphed, making important strides and innovations in science, medicine, business, politics, law, the arts, and more. As we remember, mourn, reflect, and study horrific parts of our nation's history and work to address systemic racism today, the Commission is also intended to celebrate the many accomplishments of African Americans.

This body has a history of funding the work of similar commemorative commissions and I trust that our support for the work of this commission will be no different. I remember fondly the many celebrations surrounding the 400th anniversary of the Jamestown Settlement in 2007, just a few miles up the James River from historic Point Comfort. As we look forward to the 100th anniversary of the 19th Amendment next year, I am grateful for the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission and the funding they have received to support their important work. I am also grateful for this body's generous support of the United States Semiquincentennial Commissioners as we prepare to celebrate the 250th anniversary of American independence in 2026.

It was the successes of those previous commemorative commissions that Senator TIM KAINE had in mind when he initially developed the concept for this commission and asked me to introduce his bill in the House of Representatives. Each of these commissions received generous federal appropriations.

While we were successful in getting our bill enacted and the commission established, Congress has yet to appropriate any federal funds to support the work of the 400 Years of African American History Commission. That changes with the Fiscal Year 2020 Interior bill, which already included $500,000 for the commission. The additional $500,000 of funding provided in my amendment will ensure that there are sufficient opportunities for the American people to gather, to study, to reflect, and to fully appreciate the story of African Americans, their contributions to the fabric of our nation, and their resilience over the last 400 years.

Mr. Chair, while it is imperative that we observe this year, 2019, as the 400th year since the arrival of the first enslaved Africans in the English colonies with reverence, it is equally important that we celebrate all that our communities have achieved throughout those 400 years.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in marking this occasion, as this body has so many other anniversaries, by fully supporting the Commission's ongoing work. Their efforts to preserve history and invite all Americans to reflect and remember is essential as we continue to work towards creating a more perfect union.

Ms. MOORE, Mr. Chair, I rise to thank the chair and ranking member for including my amendment to increase funding to help low-income households replace lead pipes in this en bloc amendment.

Even with the plus-ups in this bill for a number of programs within the EPA's State and Tribal Assistance Grant account, and I thank the subcommittee and full committee for their work there, the amount of resources we are providing pales considerable in comparison to the need to address water infrastructure needs.

Let's just look at this program that I am amending today. The program is authorized at $60 million. Even after the subcommittee provided a $5 million boost (and I thank the chairwoman for that), it still is only funded at a third of the authorized level.

This is a critical program because grantees are able to provide aid to low-income homeowners to replace lead service lines. Unfortunately, those households most affected by this problem often have the fewest resources to replace the pipes.

Recent media reports indicate that the EPA may be finally closer to issuing its new lead in drinking water regulations.

And while better and stronger regulations help, we won't regulate our way out of the lead poisoning crisis that is afflicting our communities.

We must put our funding where our mouths are. We must help get the lead pipes out of the ground and help homeowners get them out of their homes. We must ensure children get tested and treated, if they need it. We must ensure that homes with lead paint get remediated. And all of that takes funding—there is no substitute for that funding.

Just this past weekend, the city of Milwaukee had the honor of hosting the Great Lakes Governors and Premiers, the chief executives of what would be the third largest world economy if you added up the GDP of the individual states and provinces.

At the top of their agenda was addressing how to provide clean drinking water for the over 105 million residents of the Great Lakes region on both sides of the international border. According to the Governors and Premiers, the Great Lakes region contains the highest concentrations of lead service lines in the United States.

I want to echo the call of the Great Lakes Governors & Premiers for the federal governments ''of both the U.S. and Canada to provide appropriate resources . . . to support the accelerated replacement of Lead Service Lines.'' They also called for a comprehensive approach that leverages ''a variety of funding sources and flexibility to match the right tool with each project.''

This bill moves us forward—no question. The THUD bill that we are tackling later this week also provides increased funding for HUD's housing lead control programs. But we need to start taking much bigger steps if we are ever going to get to the point where all children will be safe from this scourge.

That's the goal of this amendment. And I thank the chairwoman for her support.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I rise to thank the chairwoman and committee for including my amendment to increase funding by $1 million for an Indian Health Service program combatting domestic violence in Native communities.

I know the chairwoman understands this issue very well. Protecting women in Native communities was a big focus on the VAWA reauthorization that passed this chamber earlier this year. I want to make sure we provide the strong funding that will be needed to make those changes reality and protect Native women. This is one program that does that.

The Indian Health Services Domestic Violence Prevention Program is a small program but it's having a big impact. The DVPP was established in 2015 as a nationally-coordinated program that provides culturally appropriate domestic violence and sexual assault prevention and intervention resources to American Indian and Alaskan Native communities with a focus on trauma informed services.

The vast majority of DVPP grants focus on domestic and sexual violence prevention, advocacy, and coordinated community responses, with some supporting forensic

healthcare services to victims of domestic and sexual violence.

I appreciate the effort made by the subcommittee in the bill to add funding to bring funding for this program back to the FY 2017 funding level. Thank you for recognizing the need and prioritizing a response.

But I think we must do better especially when you consider the staggering need here.

The statistics (as incomplete as they may be) are frightening: American Indians and Alaska Natives are 2.5 times more likely to experience violent crimes and at least 2 times more likely to experience rape or sexual assault crimes than people who are not American Indians or Alaska Natives. More than 4 in 5 American Indian and Alaska Native women, or 84.3 percent, have experienced violence in their lifetime.

There are currently some 83 tribes, tribal organizations, Urban Indian Organizations, and IHS federal facilities that receive funds totaling nearly $12 million from this program. These include projects in my city of Milwaukee as well as in Alaska, Nebraska, and Oregon, among others.

I understand the constraints that the subcommittee faces. The needs always outnumber the resources. But this is a pressing priority. This additional funding will hopefully allow for more grantees serving more tribal communities that can help begin to turn the tide.

I know the chairwoman has been a champion for Native American communities and I thank her for her support of my amendment.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to the Interior Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2020. In 2013, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Office of Law Enforcement established the Wildlife Detector Dog Program as part of a national effort to combat illegal wildlife trafficking. Certified canines and wildlife inspector handlers go through a 13-week training course at the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Detector Dog Training Center in Newman, Georgia, and they are trained for real work environments such as mail facilities, ocean containers, and air cargo warehouses. Since the program's inception, USFWS has added more wildlife detectors. There are now six detector dogs deployed at USFWS designated ports of entry: Dutton in Houston, Texas; Beans in Chicago, Illinois; Viper in Miami, Florida; Samm in San Juan, Puerto Rico; Dock in Anchorage, Alaska; and Lockett near my Congressional District in Los Angeles, California.

These highly intelligent canines, paired with highly trained handlers, are able to detect many wildlife scents, such as elephant ivory, sea turtle skin, dried seahorse, python skin, and rhino horn. USFWS has reported that the use of these dogs is far more efficient than deploying human inspectors. For every 1,000 packages sniffed by dogs, 10 packages are properly inspected by humans.

The Wildlife Detector Dog Program strengthens and expands USFWS' inspection capabilities on illegal wildlife products. With more than 18 major ports of entry across the country, I would like to take this opportunity to urge more attention and resources be dedicated to the growth and expansion of this program.

My amendment will designate $200,000 of Department of Interior appropriations for the Wildlife Detector Dog Program, which is the estimated cost of adding an additional K–9 unit to the program. I thank Chairwoman MCCOLLUM for her support on this amendment and I urge my colleagues to join us in passing it.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. 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 gentlewoman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 135 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. JACKSON LEE). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 135 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. DUNCAN. 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. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce—

(1) the final rule entitled ''Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'' published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on October 23, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 64662); or

(2) the final rule entitled ''Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'' published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on October 23, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 64510).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I rise today with an amendment to ensure that no funds go to the Obama-era Clean Power Plan.

In 2015, Obama's Environmental Protection Agency published a final rule for the Clean Power Plan, with the intent to reduce CO_2 emissions from the existing fossil fuel power plants by 32 percent by 2030. It set specific and stringent limits on greenhouse gas emissions for each State based on its electricity mix.

While this sounds well intended, it is important that we look at the costly and burdensome reality of the so-called Clean Power Plan.

It would cause a slew of economic, environmental, and legal problems. Families and businesses would be hit the hardest with more expensive energy and utility bills. And for what?

According to climatologist Paul Knappenberger: ''Even if we implement the CPP to perfection, the amount of climate change averted over the course of this century amounts to about 0.02 centigrade. This is so small as to be scientifically undetectable and environmentally insignificant.''

It is evident that the Clean Power Plan is nothing more than a feel-good environmental regulation promulgated by the radical environmental left and is based on a trajectory that is negligible, all while driving up the cost for average American families.

Beyond the negligible effects of the Clean Power Plan, it is legally unfounded and may even be unconstitutional. In the words of Laurence Tribe, who testified before Congress: ''EPA is attempting an unconstitutional trifecta: usurping the prerogatives of the States, Congress, and the Federal courts—all at once. Burning the Constitution should not become part of our national energy policy.''

Because of its legal issues, more than half the States in the country petitioned the Supreme Court to pause the Clean Power Plan implementations. A stay was issued in 2016.

I strongly commend the Trump administration for taking action on this issue this week and replacing the Clean Power Plan with the Affordable Clean Energy rule. This move paves the way for affordable and clean energy, and I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment and support continued American energy dominance.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, whether or not my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to admit it, climate change is real. It is caused by human activity. And it will—I should say, it is even currently now having devastating impacts. If we don't take bold action to reduce climate pollution, it is only going to get worse.

I believe we also have a moral obligation to future generations to leave this planet better than we found it. Limiting pollution from power plants is an important part of an overall strategy to limit carbon pollution and keep global temperatures from rising to levels that will bring unacceptable risks from extreme weather and other climate change impacts.

Therefore, I was extremely disappointed that, on Wednesday, EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler announced a rule that would repeal the Clean Power Plan, replacing it with a rule that will lead to 1,400 more deaths each year.

Those numbers, Madam Chair, are the EPA's numbers. Just think of it.

The administration that is held with the responsibility of protecting America's air and water so that it is fit for human consumption puts out a regulation to limit the pollution that actually increases the amount of pollution

that we emit, causing more deaths, more asthma attacks, more trips to the emergency room.

Every year we continue to see communities devastated by natural disasters related to our changing climate. We are spending billions of dollars each year helping these communities rebuild in the wake of those disasters.

We need action to limit climate pollution. Blocking action to limit carbon pollution from power plants is a step backwards at the exact same moment we should be leaping forward towards cleaner forms of energy.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), one of the cosponsors of this amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, specifically, the CPP aimed to dramatically reduce carbon dioxide, CO_2 emissions, from new and existing power plants. These new regulations called for an unrealistic 32 percent nationwide cut in CO_2 emissions by 2030 from 2005 levels.

I have just got to tell you, we are wrapping up scientific evidence, and we are putting a moral cloud on it. That is exactly the definition of what Alinsky wanted us to start talking about and moving processes.

These new mandates placed incredible burdens on States. They would have increased the electrical rates and endangered overall reliability of the grid. Due to this unprecedented overreach, Congress rejected these new regulations, using the Congressional Review Act.

Specifically, the Senate voted on November 17, 2015, to reject these rules, and the House followed suit on December 1, 2015. Unfortunately, President Obama decided to veto both of these pieces of legislation and continue his war on coal.

We shouldn't be picking winners and losers. Climate change has been going on for eons of time. That is why you can actually have a fossil coming from Green River, Wyoming, that is nowhere close to the ocean. I vote against this.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I believe I have the right to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), one of the other cosponsors of this amendment.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Chair, this amendment prohibits funds under this act from being used to enforce two rules under Obama's so-called Clean Power Plan.

This plan was administrative overreach, plain and simple. It would have mandated the shutdown of power plants and increased energy costs for families across the country.

The Clean Power Plan is just another example of Obama-era regulations killing American jobs, strangling our economy, and destroying our domestic energy industry.

The proposed Clean Power Plan would have required Arizona, my State, to achieve a 52 percent reduction in the CO_2 emissions rate for affected power plants and to achieve about 90 percent of that reduction by next year, 2020. That was totally unrealistic.

Arizona has Palo Verde nuclear plant. It is the largest producing nuclear plant in the entire Nation. Often Arizona produces more energy than it consumes, and so we sell our energy and our electricity throughout the Southwest. So Arizona energy is American energy.

The regulations that strangle Arizona power generating stations harm American consumers well beyond our borders. I applaud the Trump administration for recognizing the harm of the Clean Power Plan and repealing and replacing it with the Affordable Clean Energy rule.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, to be clear, many States supported the clean energy rules of the Obama administration because they know air knows no boundary. So one State decides it is not going to have clean air rules, and that drifts into the next State, affecting that State's health and quality of life. So it was prudent for the Federal Government to step in and set standards.

No one's power plant was going to be forced to be closed. They were just being told to clean up the air. So when it leaves one State to drift into the next State, it is not causing asthma attacks for children.

I believe we have a moral obligation to future generations to leave this planet better than we found it. Limiting pollution for power plants is an important part of an overall strategy to protect us from the worst impacts of climate change. We owe it to the next generation. They are watching our actions.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

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

Mr. DUNCAN. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 136 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 136 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. 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. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to plan, design, study, or construct, for the purpose of harvesting timber by private entities or individuals, a forest development road in the Tongass National Forest.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment is simple. It would restrict the subsidization of logging roads in the Tongass wilderness.

There are currently more than 5,000 miles of road that are used for logging. They are not accessible to the public. These roads are subsidized simply because the timber industry in the Tongass cannot sustain itself. It could not exist other than the fact that we build logging roads for them.

It is a problem on several levels. First and foremost, there is a long-term liability associated with them. Currently, there is some $90 million worth of deferred maintenance, and if you do not adequately maintain these logging roads, they become an environmental liability.

But more fundamentally, it is undermining this great resource. The true value of the Tongass that makes it unique and the true economic driver of the region is tourism and fishing, which is sustainable.

Alaska has been damaged by climate change more than any other State. The temperature has risen twice what we see in the rest of the country. The Tongass is part of the effort to be able to reduce climate change by providing a carbon sink.

This amendment is supported by many environmental and taxpayer advocate groups: Alaska Wilderness Action, Earthjustice, the Sierra Club. But because it is a profligate waste of tax dollars, we have Taxpayers for Common Sense and Citizens Against Government Waste that have supported this amendment, which has passed Congress in the past on a bipartisan basis.

I urge my colleagues to look hard at this unnecessary subsidization of the destruction of this precious resource making climate change worse while undermining the values that make the Tongass so valuable.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

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

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

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my good friend. I am always amazed how many people in this body know what is better for Alaska.

Four times in this last 2 weeks some of you have come out: I know what is best for Alaska.

This Roadless Rule was never to be. It was Obama's decision, and we appealed it, and we won in court. This is State land, a lot of it, we have access to, and we are going to continue that.

You say about climate change, old trees don't consume, new trees do. They clean the air out; old trees do not. We are not talking about, really, timber here, because you can't have a timber sale unless it is put up for sale. We are talking about access across Federal lands, because State land is one side—State land and Federal land in between.

We are asking, very frankly, just to have access. And that is the law. Under the ANILCA law, there was to be no more. Obama changed it by regulation. We are changing it again.

Now, I don't understand where he got this information, how he got it, what he has seen, where he has gone.

You talked about tourism. Tourism is great for you people in Oregon who want to come to Alaska, but it doesn't support our schools. It doesn't support a growing society. It, frankly, supports old growth, which has no value at all, other than to look at for a short period of time when it dies.

We had 32 forest fires last year, because you don't allow roads into an area so we can manage them, and that is wrong.

All we are asking is to have what the State was guaranteed by this body. And you are taking it away from them and saying: You don't have access to your lands. You don't have a right to build anything because you don't have the ability to have a road.

And I stand here as one Member who represents the greatest State in the Union, the largest district. I constantly see people—incinerators, game, timber, mining. Why don't you mind your own damn business? This is not yours.

I am disappointed the gentleman would do this.

You are a friend of mine. Did you ever consult me about this? No. And that is disrespectful.

Maybe I ought to think about something that makes you more respectful to me.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my friend, for introducing this amendment.

Earlier this year, I introduced a bill to codify the Roadless Rule across the country. For nearly two decades, the Roadless Rule has been an important tool for preserving pristine forests, clean water, and wildlife. It has also protected taxpayers from subsidizing even more costly road building in national forests.

No roadless place is more in need of this protection than Tongass National Forest in Alaska. The Tongass National Forest is home to some of the most undisturbed, temperate, old-growth rainforests in the world.

These 16 million acres of beautiful landscape are also a critical carbon sequestration tool and a resource for climate change mitigation.

Despite these facts and the opposition of many Alaska Native communities, as well as the concerns of the Alaska tourism and sportsmen industries, the State of Alaska has proposed to strip this forest of full Roadless protection.

Stripping Roadless Rule protections from Tongass National Forest will allow millions of taxpayer dollars to be funneled into incredibly expensive road-building projects in one of the most remote, wild parts of our country.

This amendment does not end discussion of how and where the Roadless Rule should be applied in Alaska and other States. It is much simpler than that. All this amendment does is prevent taxpayer dollars from being used to subsidize more old-growth logging in Alaska's Tongass National Forest.

Taxpayers should not have to foot the bill to construct environmentally harmful roads for the logging industry in this pristine place. This is the exact sort of fiscally responsible amendment my colleagues on the other side of the aisle should support. That is why I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in protecting Tongass National Forest and American taxpayers by supporting this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Chair, I suggest, when they talk about the taxpayer, these roads that are in place now, maintenance costs were already there. The reason they are not being used is because there is no timber in that area, which have been cut already, a very small amount of the Tongass. I am talking about State land.

By the way, can I ask the gentleman who just briefly spoke, or anybody: Have you been to the Tongass?

Do any one of you want to answer that? No. They are mimicking or parroting what has been fed to them.

This is not the United States of the Federal Government; it is the United States of America. You are taking away the right of a State of access to their land because of this action, and that is wrong.

I said we won it in court. You may not know that. We will win it again, because the law is very clear: There was to be no more in Alaska, but Obama did apply it.

So I am saying: Have at it. It is not going anywhere.

I shouldn't get excited. It is just the idea that you are supposed to be representing a form of government, and you should have a right to represent your district. That is your responsibility.

Stay out of my district, because you are not doing what is right for the State of Alaska, and that is my job. I say shame on you.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alaska has 45 seconds remaining.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

Madam Chair, 32 fires in 2015. The average over the last 10 years has been 15 to 20 fires. We ought to know better.

In Arizona, I have had to witness the most catastrophic fires in Arizona history because of our mismanagement of forests: The Wallow fire, the largest fire in Arizona history; and then the Yarnell fire, where we lost 19 firefighters.

It is incredible that what we are doing is we are trying to have jurisdiction over fires. There is a reason why we have had to subsidize that: because we have put the industry out of business by sue and settle.

Folks, there is a cost to these fires, and you have to start looking at mitigation in that aspect. If you want climate change mitigation, the best thing you can do is have a dynamic forest that actually produces more oxygen than carbon. That means medium- and small-growth trees, not old-growth trees. A happy medium of all is a dynamic forest.

So if you are preventing this—the gentleman from Arizona ought to know better. We are sitting on catastrophic results in Arizona. Let's not impugn the trees in Alaska.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, first and foremost, my friend from Alaska—who is my friend, and I respect, and have enjoyed our give-and-take over the years—misses the point. What I am talking about is Federal subsidization of logging roads.

I mentioned that there is a deferred backlog that is expensive, that the logging operations that we have do not recover enough money to fully fund the operations and the deferred maintenance. I referenced the fact that we have an opportunity to be able to focus our attention on things that really do make a difference.

I haven't spent time in the Tongass; I have spent time in Alaska. But the principle applies in Oregon and other States in terms of heavily subsidized logging roads.

Logging roads don't make forests safer. They don't prevent forest fires. And as a matter of fact, when we look at logging operations, they are often less sustainable. In fact, logging sometimes causes forest fires and puts people in these areas who cause fires.

Now, I would just respectfully suggest that what I said about Alaska being threatened more by climate change than any other, I am happy to provide my good friend from Alaska the references in terms of verifying the statistics and facts that I have used, but the fact remains this is something we shouldn't do, we don't need, and I strongly urge adoption of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. 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 Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 139 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 139 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, 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. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule entitled ''Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act'' published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on December 15, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 66496 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Madam Chair, my amendment is straightforward. It would prevent any funds in this bill from being used to carry out the EPA disastrous 2009 Endangerment Finding.

The EPA's Endangerment Finding has served as legal justification for the Federal Government to attack American energy under the guise of climate change since 2009.

The Information Quality Act provides a framework for the oversight of the quality of information disseminated by the Federal Government. Unfortunately, bureaucrats in President Obama's EPA evaded the requirements set forth in the Information Quality Act by refusing to admit that the document was a highly influential scientific assessment.

If climate change is as dire as some of my colleagues consistently argue, why then did President Obama's EPA go to such lengths to prevent their assessment from rigorous peer review?

Interesting.

In April of this year, President Trump's Office of Management and Budget released a memo to ''reinforce, clarify, and interpret agency responsibilities with regard to responsibilities under the Information Quality Act.''

In April, the Competitive Enterprise Institute petitioned the EPA to stop using the 2009 Endangerment Finding until it subjected itself to the high-level scientific peer review that is legally required under the Information Quality Act.

CEI's petition to the EPA found numerous instances in which the EPA failed to meet the Agency's own peer review standards for the highly scientific assessments. Some of the failure of the EPA noted by CEI include failing ''to allow public, including scientific and professional societies, to nominate potential reviewers,'' allowing an EPA employee to conduct peer review, utilizing peer reviewers who were reviewing their own work, and reliance on the United Nations Climate Change Panel reports that do not meet Federal peer review standards.

Completely obnoxious.

Now, even the staunchest advocates for taking aggressive action on our climate should be able to agree that the process the EPA used to adopt the Endangerment Finding failed to meet the required peer review process.

Fortunately, there is an alternative. Madam Chairwoman, I believe the best way to improve our environment and to ensure the economic prosperity of this country is to rely on sound science, not on the opinions of unelected bureaucrats at the EPA.

If climate alarmists are so confident that the 2009 Endangerment Finding is sound science, then conduct proper peer review, following the guidelines of the Information Quality Act put forth by OMB, that will assure the outcome.

Madam Chairwoman, this is not a partisan issue. No matter what side of the climate change debate you fall on, we can all agree that the EPA has evaded its responsibility to peer review and developing sound science when authoring its Endangerment Findings.

The process was broken, and good process makes good policy, which makes good politics. This body should not fund the implementation of policies based on the 2009 Endangerment Finding.

Madam Chair, I urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Chair, we have many fine employees at the EPA—great employees—and I would be hesitant to put them in the way that sometimes the term ''bureaucrat'' is used, because sometimes that can feel demeaning. So, to the great scientists in the EPA, I just want them to know that I respect their work.

□ 1430

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition, as I said, to this amendment, which would prevent the EPA from implementing its endangerment finding that greenhouse gases endanger human health and welfare.

The EPA's endangerment finding is simply a legal restating of something that the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change said. Every single scientific academy in the world—and I want to stress that, Madam Chair. I heard the gentleman talk about some kind of peer review, but I am going to go with what the national scientific academies in the world and 97 percent of climate scientists have been telling us for decades. I am going to go with 97 percent of the scientists, Madam Chair.

Whether or not my colleague on the other side of the aisle will admit it, our climate is changing. We know it in Minnesota, and I hear other people from around the country talk about it. And we do know that it is caused by human activity.

We are already experiencing negative impacts from climate change. The severity of those impacts will only increase if we don't reduce climate pollution.

The endangerment finding does not regulate climate pollution, but it does say that we need to take action to address it, and I agree.

We have a moral obligation to future generations to leave this planet better than we found it. Blocking the endangerment rule won't make that happen for future generations.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I ask one simple question: If Members of this body are so confident of the 2009 endangerment findings, then high-quality peer review would result in the same outcome, correct? What would be the fallacy with that?

Once again, good process builds good policy builds good politics. We fail to do that. We want to use science when it is convenient for us. That is the problem.

The other side calls themselves the party of science. Then they should be all for this peer review aspect. But, no, we don't want to do that because it is not convenient.

Once again, I agree. Climates are always changing. That is why we find fossilized fish up in western Wyoming. Was man around during that time? No, not at all. Were the carbon footprints

at that time very similar to what they are today? They were higher at that point in time.

Science has been peer-reviewed, and that is why we have gotten to the point that when I give you one set of circumstances, you get the same outcome. That is what peer-reviewed science is. This country is set upon sound science. We ought to determine that.

Madam Chair, I ask for everybody to vote for this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Once again, what I see is delay by not going with scientists around the world.

Madam Chair, 97 percent of the scientists leading the way on what we should be doing clearly state that human activity has a direct impact on climate change. We can't ignore the dangers of it.

We need urgent and bold action to address climate change. We don't need to be putting our heads in the sand. We don't need to be delaying.

I oppose the taxpayers of this country spending more money when we already have sound science. I oppose wasting time. So I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 140 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 140 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. GOSAR. 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 224, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,720,000) (increased by $1,720,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Chair, I thank Mr. GOSAR and the Congressional Western Caucus for bringing further attention to the scourge that is chronic wasting disease.

At the beginning of this Congress, I introduced H.R. 837, which would require the USDA and the Department of the Interior to collaborate with the National Academy of Sciences to study the predominant pathways and mechanisms for the transmission of chronic wasting disease in cervid populations.

There is a lot of CWD research out there—some good, some not so good. What we need is an authoritative and comprehensive scientific consensus on how chronic wasting disease spreads. This study will allow us to pursue the most effective methods to fight CWD, but we cannot do this without the proper resources.

I thank the committee and the subcommittee chairs, ranking members, and staff for increasing CWD funding and for providing language that encourages greater scientific collaboration within the Federal Government. This will set us on the right path to understanding how CWD infects and how it spreads, and it will give the foundation of knowledge we need to build the right policy.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment in order to be able to speak on it.

The Acting Chair. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I thank both gentlemen for their concern and dedication to this issue. In the 1990s when I served in the Minnesota House on our environment and agriculture committee, I first learned of chronic wasting disease and the way that it was frightening hunters and people who like to consume deer meat.

We took some action when I was in the statehouse to address this, only to find out it is a bigger flare-up and something that we need to address.

In my home State of Minnesota, under the leadership of Governor Walz, we are putting more time, more energy, and more resources into working on this issue. That is why my colleagues will find that the House report accompanying the Interior bill highlights the committee's concern about chronic wasting disease and the need to continue to collaborate with partners to develop early detection tools and compounds to disrupt the transmission of this deadly disease.

As of June 7, 2019, chronic wasting disease has been reported in at least 24 States in the continental United States as well as in two provinces in Canada. Once this disease is established in an area, the risks can remain for a long time in the environment, and we are finding out that ''a long time'' is a long time.

The lack of treatment or vaccines for this insidious disease highlights the need for more research. As a member of the Agriculture Committee, we have been talking to the USDA about what we can do about disposing of these carcasses because this disease not only appears in the wild, it also appears in some captive herds that are used for consumption.

I want my colleagues to know that I look forward to working with them on this issue. I wanted to use this as an opportunity to let both gentlemen know that it is in the report language, and we look forward to the authorizers working more so we can do even more to address this disease.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentlemen once again for their amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota. Chronic wasting disease is 100 percent fatal. We have similar diseases like mad cow disease in cattle and scrapie in sheep.

One of the things that we are very concerned with, as the gentlewoman alluded to, is that we have no testing available for hunter populations. Is it communicable to human beings and to other aspects of agriculture? Those are some of the things that we really need to address.

As the gentlewoman said, we have now seen it in 25 States, so it is spreading. Once again, being 100 percent fatal, we have to address this because we have whole populations that are at stake.

We can put our ingenuity to task here. We can solve this problem, but it is at the forefront.

I thank the gentleman from Louisiana. As a veterinarian, as a physician, he understands the dire ramifications of this. I thank the gentlewoman for accepting this.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 143 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 143 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. DUNCAN. 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 286, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 11.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I rise today with an amendment at the desk to ensure that we develop energy resources located in a small part of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

This development is long overdue, and the decision of Congress to authorize that development through the historic tax reform legislation should not be revisited. We should proceed as planned to further American energy dominance.

The opening of a small part of ANWR for oil and gas drilling will increase access to our resources and will help decrease the prices of oil and gas for the American people.

Alaska contains 192 million acres of parks, refuges, wilderness areas, and nature preserves, and 19.5 million acres of this is in ANWR. Before tax reform and the opening of ANWR, 92 percent of the 19.5 million couldn't legally be touched by drilling.

The law changed to open new opportunities for responsible energy development, and we shouldn't backtrack. This area was set aside to be opened in 1980 by a Democrat-controlled Congress and is limited to 2,000 Federal acres, just 0.0001 percent of the ANWR.

We should move forward with the development of this region as it will create jobs, lower prices of oil and gas, and continue to move us forward with American energy dominance.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and our continued energy success in the United States, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting Chair. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment that would strike section 118 from the bill.

I want to begin by setting the record straight on what section 118 of the Interior bill does and does not do. The opponents of this amendment have characterized the Interior language as preventing energy leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, ANWR. That is an outright misstatement, Madam Chair. Although, as I will explain, I can understand why those who championed the inflated revenue numbers 18 months ago might be a little worried.

On the contrary, the language says that when the Department of the Interior offers those leases up for sale, it simply must make sure that the sale raises more than the $500 million that was promised.

In 2017, the Republicans were putting together their tax bill. The budget resolution directed the House Natural Resources Committee and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee to come up with legislation that would raise $1 billion over 10 years.

□ 1445

Since the lease, that $1 billion was supposed to help offset the cost of a $5 trillion tax cut. In reality, I believe it was a scam to get around a point of order. Once the ANWR provision was included in the tax bill, the Congressional Budget Office said the provision would raise little more than $2 billion over 10 years, and, by law, half of those revenues go to the Federal Treasury and half go to the State of Alaska.

According to the CBO, which got its information from the Interior Department, the first resale was going to raise $1 billion with $500 million going to the Federal Government. Well, if that $500 million is what the Interior Department told CBO they could raise from our public lands, then they should have no problem with the language in our bill, because that is exactly what our language does. It tells the Interior Department that if you decide to go forward with the lease sale next year, then you need to raise the $500 million you promised the American people. That is called accountability, and the taxpayers have a right to expect it.

Now, since we don't know exactly how many acres Interior intends to offer up for lease, and we can't know the exact per acre dollar amount, but if the department leases a minimum of 400,000 acres required by law, then all it needs to do is put out a lease sale requirement to the companies to bid $2,500 an acre for these public lands.

Apparently, the administration and the congressional opponents are having second thoughts about those promises now and want a little amnesty. On May 21, the Office of Management and Budget sent the Appropriations Committee a letter making it clear that the administration opposes section 118 language. OMB says that the $500 million figure was arbitrary and unrealistic.

Now, how could the administration claim that that number was arbitrary and unrealistic when CBO estimates were based on the administration's data?

Where was OMB in December of 2017 when CBO first came out?

More importantly, where were the congressional opponents of drilling ANWR back then?

Why didn't they sound a little alarmed 18 months ago?

Why not speak up and say: ''Wait a minute, I think this number is too high, maybe it is unrealistic''?

Well, I suspect they thought they would never be held responsible for the projections that they were touting back then, and maybe that explains why the language in the Interior bill is characterized as preventing lease sales. Supporters know that the department is required to live up to the promises everyone made, and they may be unattainable to achieve.

So let me be clear. I oppose opening up ANWR for drilling. But now that it is in the tax bill, we have an obligation to make sure that the American taxpayer is protected, and the language currently in the Interior bill does exactly that, Madam Chair. It ensures that the public property is not given away to the oil and gas industry for a song.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), who is one of the cosponsors of the amendment and the dean of the House.

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

We passed the same opening of ANWR 14 times in this House, including when the Democrats controlled it, because this was set up by Moe Udall, Senator Jackson, Ted Stevens, and myself for an area that has potential great value to this Nation and, of course, the State of Alaska. That has been decided. Because they said at that time and I said at that time that if Congress was to say we should open ANWR, drilling can take place.

Now, as far as the figures go, one of the things that bothers me, because the statement says 50 percent of the CBO score, one score, the first sale may not make that.

But who is to say what the second sale is going to make or the third sale?

So the total amount is for the Treasury of the United States of America.

This area is not pristine. I have to say that. I wish some people would go up and see it. It has been developed before by defense systems. The people there who live there, the Native people, the Inuits, they support it. The State of Alaska supports it. It is the right thing to do for America.

This is a backdoor approach by certain people of the other party who want to not open ANWR. You lost that battle. We won. For the good of the country, the good of the State, and for the good of the people, we won. This is a back way to stop it.

I believe we are going to raise that money. That is how confident I am. I think the sales will produce what we say. So I am not going to really get excited about this, because it is not going to go anywhere. Thank God we have got two Senators for every State. It is the right thing to do. That is why the Constitution and the forefathers made it that way. So I have got two Senators who will make sure this doesn't go anywhere.

I appreciate those who oppose it. I thank the chairwoman for actually saying she does oppose opening ANWR. I respect that. I happen to support it, and I think I will be proven right.

I believe this amendment is the right way to go. I think we ought to eliminate the question, so I am going to urge a ''yes'' vote on this legislation. It is the right thing to do. Then let's go forward and really govern for the future. That is important. We are missing that.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairman, this amendment attempts to change the requirements for oil and gas leases. I will say it's very entrepreneurial in its disguise.

But I want to remind people in regard to how big this aspect is. This is a small, little area. To give you an example, ANWR is the size of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New Hampshire combined. Energy developed with ANWR is just one-fifth the size of the Dulles Airport. Amazing. If you have ever been there, it is something to be seen.

As the Congressional Western Caucus chairman, we actually took that liberty of going up there and being hosted by the gentleman from Alaska. What you are being told and what is being there in aspect isn't the same.

So, Madam Chair, I actually join the gentleman from South Carolina and ask for a ''yes'' vote.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Chair.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. When it comes to ANWR, there is no such thing as a noncontroversial policy provision. This one found its way into the Interior-Environment spending bill at a time when longstanding bipartisan provisions have fallen out.

As I mentioned during general debate on this spending package, we need to remove these poison pill riders before we can reach a longstanding bipartisan agreement. That is why I support the amendment to strike this controversial policy position.

Madam Chair, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. May I inquire how much time I have on closing, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Well, Madam Chair, facts speak for themselves. This sale was used to offset the tax bill, to keep the American people confident that we were going to have our house in order when the tax bill passed. Well, the first sale was supposed to guarantee $500 million, and if they get less than that on the first sale, as the gentleman said, how much lower does it go on the second?

I just remind people that we need to protect the American taxpayer on this one and make sure that we don't get taken to the cleaners.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

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

Mr. DUNCAN. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 144 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

AMENDMENT NO. 147 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 147 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. MULLIN. 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. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the final rule entitled ''Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources'' published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on June 3, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 35824).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, this amendment would prohibit funds for enforcing the Obama administration EPA methane rule. The rule is currently facing litigation and uncertainty, and Congress must act to block this job-killing regulation estimating that it will cost the economy roughly $530 million annually.

While oil and gas production has increased over 25 percent since 2005, related methane gas emissions have actually decreased over 40 percent during the same period, meaning the industry is doing a good job of regulating themselves.

It is counterproductive for the Federal Government to enact harmful regulations that cause inefficiencies and recklessly spending taxpayer dollars enforcing hardships on true job creators.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I rise in very strong opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, this amendment would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from enforcing commonsense rules requiring oil and gas industries to prevent natural gas leaks from their drilling operations. The rule has been in effect for 3 years now, and the oil and gas industry is complying with those regulations.

Preventing methane leaks has an important public health benefit. Leaks from natural gas operations are significant sources of ozone pollution which trigger asthma attacks and send thousands of children to emergency rooms every year.

This rule actually saves the oil and gas industry money because natural gas that is not wasted can be sold.

The proponents of this amendment argue that the rule isn't necessary because oil and gas companies have an incentive to prevent leaks. But the simple fact is leaks continue to happen unless companies are required to prevent them. People might not like eating their vegetables, but we are all better off for doing it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. My colleague, Mr. MULLIN, is absolutely correct. When former President Obama directed the EPA, BLM, and other agencies to target industries for greenhouse gas emissions, they went directly for the oil and natural gas first.

But this EPA rule targeting methane is completely unnecessary. It is produced as a byproduct of oil and natural gas production, but it is a valuable product in itself that can be sold and is sold. It is something that oil and gas companies routinely capture and sell. They were doing a great job of this even before this rule. It was unnecessary.

Even EPA estimates show that the methane emissions have decreased while the production of natural gas and oil have increased over the same period. The free market has provided an incentive to reduce methane release on its own. There is no further need for the EPA to impose this bureaucratic hurdle. It is expensive. The cost is estimated to cost our economy $530 million annually. Amazing.

Once again, as Ronald Reagan used to say:

Government is not the solution, government is the problem.

This is a regulation in search of a problem.

Madam Chair, I support the gentleman's amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, in closing, during the conversation that was taking place just a second ago, a comment was made that said it actually saves the industry money. I got have got to step back and think, how is that possible? Because if it was saving the industry money they wouldn't oppose it.

If it is saving money, who would oppose it?

I haven't met a regulation ever from a small business owner—which is the only reason why I am here, because of the job-killing regulations that come out of this place constantly—that has ever saved me any money.

What we are talking about are real jobs that affect real people's lives.

This Congress always talks about job creation and creating job packages. We want to brag about how many jobs we have created. This body doesn't create jobs. We are supposed to create an environment in which job creators can create a job, and we are saying this one will kill jobs.

So why would we support this?

It doesn't make any sense to me.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, we know for a fact that methane leaks

contribute to ground level ozone pollution. We know that that is harmful to human beings. We do know that reducing leaks improves the bottom line for the oil and gas companies.

So I oppose this amendment. And I want to stand with common sense to do everything possible to keep these leaks from happening in the future.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 Oklahoma will be postponed.

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 148 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 148 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. MULLIN. 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. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prepare, propose, or promulgate any regulation or guidance that references or relies on the analysis contained in—

(1) ''Technical Support Document: Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866'', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in February 2010;

(2) ''Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866'', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013 and revised in November 2013;

(3) ''Revised Draft Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in NEPA Reviews'', published by the Council on Environmental Quality on December 24, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 77802);

(4) ''Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866'', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in July 2015;

(5) ''Addendum to Technical Support Document on Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis under Executive Order 12866: Application of the Methodology to Estimate the Social Cost of Methane and the Social Cost of Nitrous Oxide'', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016; or

(6) ''Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866'', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, my amendment would prohibit funds from implementing the social cost of carbon rule.

The Obama administration continuously used social cost of carbon models which can be easily manipulated in order to attempt to justify, once again, new job-killing regulations.

I offered this same amendment yesterday, and, unfortunately, it failed. Until then, the House had a clear, strong record of opposition to the social cost of carbon, voting at least 12 times to block, defund, or oppose the proposal.

We want clean air; we want clean water; and we take care of the land we live on. Using subjective standards to create job-killing regulations is not the way to accomplish this goal.

The social cost of carbon rule is nothing more than more burdensome red tape for the American people.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I am sorry to say that I have to oppose the amendment from the gentleman from Oklahoma and appreciate his thoughts, but he is completely wrong.

The amendment is a harmful rider that would prohibit the EPA from considering the social cost of carbon as part of rulemakings.

The ''social cost of carbon'' may sound a little confusing to people, but, frankly, it is an estimate of the economic damages associated with the small increase in carbon dioxide emissions in a given year. It represents, currently, our best scientific information available for incorporating the impacts from carbon pollution into regulatory analysis.

Weakening or eliminating the use of the social cost of carbon as a tool for Federal agencies would ignore the sobering cost of health, environmental and economic impacts of extreme weather, rising temperatures, intensifying smog, and other impacts.

We just cannot afford to abandon science at this critical moment in time. Our country needs to face the challenges ahead of us with climate change and have the best scientific tools available, and this is one.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

Madam Chairwoman, I rise today in support of this commonsense amendment that will protect American jobs and the economy but prohibit funds from being used for implementing the Obama administration's flawed social cost of carbon, or SCC, valuation.

This job-killing and unlawful guidance sneakily attempts to pave the way for cap-and-trade-like mandates. Congress and the American people have repeatedly rejected cap-and-trade proposals.

Knowing that he could not lawfully enact a carbon tax plan, President Obama attempted to circumvent Congress by playing loose and fast with the Clean Air Act to unilaterally implement this unlawful new requirement under the guise of guidance.

The social cost of carbon is not based on science, and the models can be easily manipulated to arrive at whatever conclusion is desired.

Once again, when we look at carbon, it is a nutrient for plants. To say otherwise is disrespectful. Once again, we play loose and fast with sound science.

So, in regards to this, the House has decisively voted a dozen times to block or defund and oppose the social cost of carbon. I support the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, while I respect the gentlewoman's opinion—and this is one of those things where we agree to disagree—I do have to say one thing.

She said the science in measuring the social cost of carbon has proven true. Actually, that is not true. The science isn't there. We actually don't have a good method to measure the social cost of carbon.

That is why the whole issue is that it can easily be manipulated to fit whatever model they choose, which means that they can pick and choose what type of energy we are able to produce and how we produce it, meaning that they can choose, not the consumer, to say: We no longer want to have fossil fuels as a choice; we only want renewables.

If we are going to be an all-of-the-above country and we are going to embrace industry and entrepreneurs, then we have got to embrace all of the above. If consumers don't want that, if certain States don't want to buy fossil fuel energy, then they can choose not to do so.

In Oklahoma, we are all of the above. Not only are we a leader in producing fossil fuels, but we are also the third largest in producing renewables. We believe all of the above.

Our neighbor in Texas, while they are a leader in producing oil, they are the number one in renewables.

Isn't it ironic that both are red States?

All we are saying here is let's not manipulate and allow the government

to pick and choose. Let the consumer choose.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I do appreciate my colleague from Oklahoma clarifying that it is a big State for renewables and Texas is as well, and I encourage them to continue farther down that path because that is certainly an important challenge that we have to overcome is having more renewables in our country.

I would again say that climate change is the greatest environmental threat that mankind has ever faced. We need to deploy every available tool at our disposal and address this crisis, including the best available science and economics, which I believe is also represented in the social cost of carbon analysis.

I strongly oppose the Mullin amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HIMES). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 151 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 151 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 288, line 24, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000) (increased by $500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chair, today I rise in support of my amendment which would demonstrate the environmental benefits of the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement, as well as show the cost of delaying passage of this agreement.

USMCA is groundbreaking in more ways than one. It will create thousands of U.S. jobs, improve our economy, increase U.S. agriculture exports, and reduce our trade deficits with Mexico.

Thanks to President Trump, this trade agreement is also a great achievement for the environment. USMCA brings all environmental provisions into the core of the agreement, which means that they can be fully enforced.

The agreement contains the first-of-its-kind language on improving air quality as well as appropriate procedures for environmental impact assessments.

The agreement takes a commonsense approach by creating a partnership between the U.S. and two of its most important trade allies toward a unified goal of improving the environment.

Importantly, the agreement also maintains each country's sovereignty over their own laws. This will create more environmental benefits than anything offered by my friends across the aisle who, so far, have only come up with eradicating U.S. agriculture, eliminating cows, and eliminating air travel.

My amendment would direct the EPA to use these funds to produce reports that would demonstrate the environmental improvements that we are not benefiting from every day this agreement is not in effect. This way, the American people can see firsthand what the cost of delay truly is.

Just yesterday, Mexico voted overwhelmingly to ratify this agreement. Canada is moving forward as well. It is time for Democrats to decide what is worse for them: giving President Trump a win or allowing the U.S. to remain in an outdated trade agreement that is not up to the standards we hold today.

USMCA is a great agreement for the American people, and it is time to vote. I urge a ''yes'' vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 156 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 156 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) alter or terminate the Interagency Agreement between the United States Department of Labor and the United States Department of Agriculture governing the funding, establishment, and operation of Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers (or any agreement of the same substance); or

(2) close any of the following Civilian Conservation Centers:

(A) Angell Job Corps Civilian Conversation Center.

(B) Boxelder Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(C) Centennial Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(D) Collbran Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(E) Columbia Basin Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(F) Curlew Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(G) Great Onyx Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(H) Harpers Ferry Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(I) Lyndon B. Johnson Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(J) Jacobs Creek Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(K) Mingo Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(L) Pine Ridge Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(M) Schenck Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(N) Trapper Creek Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(O) Weber Basin Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(P) Wolf Creek Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(Q) Anaconda Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(R) Blackwell Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(S) Cass Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(T) Flatwoods Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(U) Fort Simcoe Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(V) Frenchburg Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(W) Oconaluftee Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(X) Pine Knot Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(Y) Timber Lake Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on my bipartisan amendment to prevent any funding in this Interior appropriations bill from being used to close or transfer the operation of U.S. Forest Service Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, after overwhelming concern expressed by a broad coalition of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol, I am pleased to report that the Secretary of Agriculture, Sonny Perdue, has listened to our concerns and informed us that the proposal to end the CCC program will be withdrawn.

Over the past several weeks, I have helped lead this coalition to tell the important story of our Civilian Conservation Centers and the value they provide in supporting rural communities and maintaining our public lands, actively managing our Nation's forests, and helping restore communities harmed by catastrophic wildfires.

I would like to thank Secretary Perdue for listening to the concerns of central Washington communities and for preserving the unique and important role these centers play in rural communities.

I look forward to working in partnership with the CCCs; the U.S. Forest Service; and our many local, regional, and Federal partners in strengthening

these programs so they can continue to efficiently and effectively support the U.S. Forest Service motto of: Caring for the Land and Serving People.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to withdraw my amendment, but I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to echo Mr. NEWHOUSE's comments et large.

The Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers are a critical aspect of rural America's ability to fight fires and do good work in rural America.

I want to applaud Secretary Perdue for reversing his decision. It is one thing to be here in Washington, DC, and think you are counting the taxpayers' money very carefully and doing the right thing; it is another thing to be out in the real world and live the life that we have out there in timber country and know what valuable lessons they provide these at-risk youth who, frankly, would have no other options going forward and, at this point, fight our devastating wildfires. They are adjunct to the professional people that we have out there.

I thank Representatives NEWHOUSE, DEFAZIO, GIANFORTE, and even Senator MERKLEY on the Senate side. This is one area where you have nice bipartisan, bicameral support, and it is an area where it is good to see Congress come together and the executive branch understand the realities of the world.

Mr. Chair, I really appreciate everyone's efforts. It has been fun to work on that.

□ 1515

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment, and I thank my colleague from the Appropriations Committee for doing this. This is an important amendment that would prohibit any changes to the Job Corps centers or their closure.

I appreciate that Secretary Perdue has announced his change of heart, but I want to make sure that the administration doesn't change the plan again.

I think everyone else has said it very articulately. These are really important operations. They teach our young people a tremendous number of things. They provide full-time and temporary jobs. In New England—as on the West Coast, I am sure—we need a lot of these people to help us with some of the challenges that are going on today.

The Department of Labor had previously announced a proposal to close nine of the facilities. That would have impacted 356 full-time and 107 temporary and contract employees. More than 3,000 students were at risk of losing the opportunity to develop the skills and work experience they need to get jobs, and that would include the 966 students at centers that have been proposed for closure.

Our Nation would lose out as well. We have already heard some of the ways that would happen on the West Coast, as it certainly would on the East Coast as well. These are countless hours for young people in conservation work, forest restoration work, and wildland firefighting.

To quote a USDA web page, I will say that ''there has never been a time when Civilian Conservation Centers were more necessary or a more worthwhile investment in our Nation's future.''

Mr. Chair, I concur with the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend and colleague from Maine, Ms. PINGREE, as well as my good friend and colleague from Oregon, Mr. SCHRADER, for their comments.

In the weeks since this proposal had been announced to close the Forest Service Job Corps CCCs, I know my colleagues have, and I also have, received dozens of personal accounts and testimonials from men and women across my district whose lives were profoundly impacted for the better by the CCC program. I will quote a couple of those comments, Mr. Chair.

The first one: ''Job Corps saved my life.''

''The 10 months I spent at Fort Simcoe were the most beneficial months of my life.''

Another person said of the program: The CCC ''didn't just change my life but saved my life.''

''I am so grateful for Columbia Basin Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center. . . . If they hadn't accepted me, I would be in a different, much worse phase of my life.''

Mr. Chair, I would, again, like to thank the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. PERDUE, for hearing the strong support expressed by my colleagues and myself on behalf of the U.S. Forest Service Job Corps CCC program.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 158 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 158 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 285, strike line 6 and all that follows through line 25.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, this amendment is pretty simple. Section 117 in division C of the base text of the bill prevents the Department of the Interior from carrying out a NEPA review, a National Environmental Policy Act review, for the planning of offshore energy production.

Mr. Chair, we just heard a few amendments back, debate about the importance of science, the importance of data. Let's be clear what this provision does. This provision prevents the Federal Government from opening up the plan for an environmental review, from subjecting it to public feedback. It prevents data and information to make informed decisions.

Mr. Chair, there is a process under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act where you go do an offshore plan. It is a pretty clear process. If folks have a problem with that, amend the law. Amend the law, don't use the appropriations process to prevent the public from getting access to information and access to data so the Federal Government can make an informed decision.

This is flawed text of the amendment. Our amendment simply helps to address it, to allow for an open, public process so we can make the right, informed decision with the right science and the right data, as my friends were recently speaking about.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which would strike section 117 from the bill.

I have been a strong opponent of the current administration's offshore drilling proposals. I am proud to have the chance to manage this time in opposition to this amendment, which would be so devastating to States like my home State of Maine.

I want to start by correcting a mischaracterization that I think has been made. The description of the gentleman's amendment states that it is removing language from the Interior bill ''which prohibits funds'' for the administration's 5-year offshore drilling plan. That is actually not correct.

The language in the bill does not prohibit the administration from working on its plan. What the language in section 117 does is to tell the Interior Department that if it moves forward with oil and gas activities in 2020, it must do so only with respect to lease sales that have been through the entire approval and review process spelled out in the law.

Our language recognizes the fact that the 2017 offshore drilling plan under the previous Presidential administration is the only plan that has completed all the steps required by the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. Because of

that, we agree that the Interior Department is free to continue to implement the previous 2017 narrow plan.

In the meantime, it is true that the current administration is working on a new oil and gas drilling plan that would cover the 2019 to 2024 timeframe. This new plan, if implemented, would open up the entire East and West Coasts to drilling.

To date, the current administration has put out one iteration of its plan, with two more to go. Despite not having completed the process, the administration has acknowledged it is already conducting pre-lease work in the mid-Atlantic, south Atlantic, and southern California planning areas.

The budget for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management states that it is preparing ''four new environmental impact statements for the lease sales that are planned in early 2020 or early 2021,'' which is where the problem comes in.

The new 5-year plan, which is nothing more than a work in progress, is under siege, both from the courts and a complete lack of political support. In late March, a Federal court reinstated the moratorium in the north Atlantic planning area. That decision has essentially frozen work on the new plan.

In fact, the Secretary told me, under questioning in an Interior Subcommittee hearing last month, that he did not know the outcome of the proposed plan. He said a new plan wasn't ''imminent.'' He was also quick to point out that no previous 5-year plan has ever included drilling in a State that was opposed to such activity.

If that is his bottom line, then he might as well throw in the towel right now as there is not a single State along the Atlantic or Pacific Coasts that is in favor of drilling.

My home State of Maine has a $5.6 billion tourism industry, 71 percent of which comes directly from the Maine coast. Thirty thousand Mainers make their living in marine industries. Our world-famous lobster fishery alone brings in $500 million annually.

Our Governor, our Senators, our congressional delegation, and many of our cities and towns oppose the OCS drilling proposal.

As nearly one-third of the United States population lives in the coastal areas impacted by this proposal, and there is broad bipartisan opposition to this issue, moving forward makes no sense, either fiscally or practically.

The language in our Interior bill simply supports that position. It says to follow the law, complete all procedural steps, including responding to the concerns of the American public, the concerns of their Governors, and the concerns of their Members of Congress, before moving forward on individual drilling projects.

To the Department, it says to save its money until it completes the process and finds out if it can drill for oil off the coast of South Carolina or off the coast of Florida or off the coast of California.

Following a well-thought-out process, especially one contained in law, shouldn't be controversial, and I don't think it is.

As such, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana; protect our coastlines from Maine to Florida, from Washington State to California; and support the process contained in the OCS Lands Act.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chair, section 117 of this bill is just another example of the anti-American energy agenda being pushed by this Democratic majority.

The draft Outer Continental Shelf leasing program proposed by the Trump administration is actually a forward-looking energy policy that takes full advantage of our vast offshore oil and gas resources. This includes expanding lease sales in the eastern Gulf of Mexico in a manner that does not interfere with our critical defense mission.

In fact, fully utilizing our offshore mineral resources in the Gulf is vital to our national defense because it will make the U.S. more energy independent and will let us continue to be the worldwide leader in energy production.

The draft proposal in this program will also create thousands of jobs and boost economies of energy-producing States like Louisiana.

We should not delay offshore mineral leasing. Any attempt by the Democrats to stop an America- and Louisiana-first energy policy should be fought tooth and nail.

Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend for offering this amendment to strike section 117, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, let me run through a few points here to see if I can clarify a number of the remarks.

The base text of the bill actually prevents the Department of the Interior from carrying out the steps that are required.

Think about the concept of what was said, Mr. Chair. It was said that they want the Department of the Interior to follow the law. Well, what would they be doing otherwise?

The provision in the bill, section 117, prevents them from carrying out preleasing activities. This text prevents them from being able to follow the law.

I am baffled by this, and I am happy to have a much longer discussion on how an offshore plan and leasing program is put together.

What the base text of the bill does is it tries to force the Obama-era plan from ever being changed. The base text prevents the process that is in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act from being allowed to go forward.

Mr. Chair, what is really important to talk about here, when you go back to look at what energy policies and different administrative policies have done, do you know that back during the Obama administration in 2011, one half of this Nation's trade deficit was attributable to us bringing in energy from other sources, bringing them in from foreign countries, empowering their economies, creating jobs in their countries?

I am an American. I represent people here. I am trying to help make sure that we have a healthy economy and that we have affordable energy.

Mr. Chair, folks are going to try and say, oh, this affects emissions and climate change. Our gas, which is replacing the dirtier Russian natural gas, is actually reducing global climate emissions, which is part of our strategy that has resulted in the United States having greater emissions reduction than any other country in the world.

It is really fun to go out and talk about all these things, but we have to keep this based in facts and statistics. This amendment makes sense. It simply does allow the Department of the Interior to follow the law, making sure we maximize our resources.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I am sorry to disagree, but I hope that my colleagues won't be fooled by the comments coming from the proponents of this amendment.

This is not about energy security or energy imports and exports. It is not about jobs. Instead, this is about whether the Interior Department is going to be held to the same procedural standard we expect every other department and agency to adhere to.

□ 1530

Mr. Chair, if my colleagues think the Department of the Interior should follow the law and complete the process, then I urge them to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to Joint Resolutions of the following titles in which

the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 27. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, and Australia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 28. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 29. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 30. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 31. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 32. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 33. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 34. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 35. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 36. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 37. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 38. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 39. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services.

S.J. Res. 40. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services.

S.J. Res. 41. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Government of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of technical data and defense services.

S.J. Res. 42. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services.

S.J. Res. 43. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 44. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed retransfer of certain defense articles from the United Arab Emirates to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

S.J. Res. 45. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 46. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 47. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 48. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 161 OFFERED BY MR. HICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HIMES). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 161 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 23.6 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today because of my deep concerns over our national debt.

At a time when our Federal debt exceeds $22 trillion, I believe it is time that we make every effort possible to rein in spending so that we are not shackling future generations with this burden.

Division C of H.R. 3055 funds the EPA, Department of the Interior, and other land management agencies at $37.4 billion and increases spending by $1.6 billion over fiscal year 2019 levels.

The spending level in this division is 23.6 percent over the President's budget request. That is almost $7 billion over the request, Mr. Chairman. We are not even close.

Without question, there are areas within these Federal agencies that need improvement. For example, we need desperately to fix the National Park Service maintenance backlog, and I commend Ranking Member BISHOP for his diligent work on that effort, and would urge passage, and at least bring to the floor his thoughtful and cost-effective bill to address that issue. But at the end of the day, the bottom line is our constituents back home are required week after week, month after month to make tough choices when it comes to planning their own household budgets, and we need to do the same right here in Congress.

My proposed amendment will reduce spending levels to the President's original budget request so that, just like our constituents back home, we go back to the table, we go back to the drawing board, and we make those same tough decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment to rein in spending, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment. I appreciate the thoughts of the gentleman, but this is the wrong place to go about it.

This amendment just indiscriminately cuts programs in this bill without any thought to the relative merit of the programs contained in the bill.

For instance, this cut would result in fewer patients seen at the Indian Health Service, fewer safety inspectors ensuring accidents do not occur, deferred maintenance on our Nation's water and sanitation infrastructure.

More generally, investments in our environmental infrastructure and our public lands will be halted and the associated jobs will be lost.

This amendment would not encourage the agencies to do more with less. Simply put, it would force the agencies and our constituents to do less with less.

Yes, it is true the Interior budget does not meet the same numbers that the President sent over to us, but the President cut the Environmental Protection Agency by a third, he cut the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities. I can make a very long list that the President cut that this Congress would never stand for.

So this does not stand. We cannot go back to the President's original budget. We must stand together to oppose this amendment, which if it was passed, would harm the American people.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment and encourage my colleagues to join me in opposing it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 163 OFFERED BY MR. BANKS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 163 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. Each amount made available by this division (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 14 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It reduces spending in this division by 14 percent, the amount that is needed to avoid busting the budget caps and preventing sequestration.

With these spending packages, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are making it clear that they have no interest in reducing our national debt. If they did, they would not be proposing bills that would bust the budget caps by nearly $90 billion, which they are fully aware would trigger sequestration and lead to devastating and severe cuts to our national defense.

In this division alone, they are proposing to spend $37.2 billion, which is $1.73 billion above the previous year's enacted amount and $7.2 billion over the President's 2020 request. This does not even include the $2.2 billion in additional funding that is not subject to the caps.

Again, my amendment would bring spending in this division to the level needed to avoid sequestration through a 14 percent across-the-board cut.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment, once again, indiscriminately cuts programs in this bill without any thought to the relative merit of the programs contained in the bill.

To just reiterate again, fewer patients would be seen at Indian Health Services, fewer safety inspectors would be ensuring that we don't have oil and gas accidents on public lands or the other areas which they oversee, deferred maintenance on our Nation's drinking water—we don't want another Flint—deferred maintenance on sanitation infrastructure.

One of the things that Members came up and asked me for, by and large, to make sure that we took a hard look to see what we could do to make sure that we protected our Nation's drinking water, and we moved on what we could do with our sanitation infrastructure.

The National Estuary Program by the President was zeroed out; the USGS science was cut; school construction for Native American children, the future of their communities, the future of our shared Nation, zeroed out; the arts, the humanities, zeroed out; and the EPA cut by 31 percent, the agency that is in charge of making sure we have clean air and clean water.

More generally, investments in our environmental infrastructure and our public lands would be halted and the associated jobs would be lost.

This legislation in front of us today that we are talking about creates lots of good jobs, lots of good-paying construction jobs that are important to the health of our communities.

This amendment would not encourage agencies to do more with less. They would simply force the agencies and our constituents to do less with less, and they have been doing that for too long.

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

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Chairman, frankly, the arguments from my colleagues who oppose this amendment simply don't add up.

By busting the budget caps, the nondefense programs that they are so passionately defending would face $55 billion in automatic cuts.

So it seems my colleagues are willing to allow reductions in nondefense spending if they can also force reckless defense cuts that endanger national security.

While that may be acceptable to those on the other side of the aisle, it is not acceptable to me.

My amendment will bring spending in this division to the level needed to avoid sequestration and to protect our national security.

Mr. Chairman, when I ran for this position, I promised my constituents that I would do my part to rein in Washington's spending addiction and safeguard the strength of the American military.

Mr. Chair, I am proud that this amendment accomplishes both of those goals. I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I rise in reluctant opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Under Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the Constitution: ''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.''

That function resides within the appropriately named Appropriations Committee, and I take great pride in having served on this committee.

Every year, we dedicate a great deal of time to crafting and amending the annual spending bills to fulfill this constitutional responsibility and to keep the Federal Government operating.

We spend countless hours hearing from agency officials, outside advocates, and our fellow Members of Congress about our budgetary needs. We make tough choices regarding prioritization.

That is why I must oppose this amendment and I oppose the previous amendment.

Rather than evaluating the worthiness of each individual program, the amendment would indiscriminately cut funding across the board.

Such drastic cuts could harm bipartisan efforts to improve healthcare for American Indians and Alaska Natives; combat invasive species like Asian carp and zebra mussels; prevent devastating wildfires; address the maintenance backlogs at National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service sites; and provide payments to local communities under the Payment in Lieu of Taxes, or PILT, program.

Therefore, even though I share some of the gentleman's concerns about the excessive spending in these bills, I must oppose the amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, am I correct that the author of the amendment has yielded back his time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has the only time remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, first, I would just like to address some of the comments that the gentleman made.

I have the honor and privilege of serving on the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee as vice chair with Chairman VISCLOSKY, and I take great pride in the bipartisan work, the nonpartisan work that we do to make sure that our military is strong and our intelligence agencies have the tools they need to keep America safe.

Mr. Chair, I just wanted to add that for the record, because there was, I think, some confusion as to where I and my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee on both sides of the aisle, when it came to defense, what our positions were. Our positions are making sure our servicemen and -women have what they need to fulfill their mission and come home safely.

But going back to the comments about this amendment, we need to

stand together. We need to stand together to oppose this amendment, because it will harm the American people.

There will be less clean water to drink, our air will be not as well protected, people will go without healthcare, and our communities will suffer.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment and I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposing it.

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

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

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

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Chairman, 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.

□ 1545

AMENDMENT NO. 165 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 165 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Integrated Risk Information System of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I heard right, the previous two amendments were criticized for being overly broad and indiscriminate in the ways that they attacked spending in this particular underlying legislation. Well, I am laser focused. I am laser focused with my amendment.

My amendment would restrict funds from going to the EPA's Integrated Risk Information System, or IRIS. That program is supposed to be developing impartial science-based toxicity assessments on chemicals for uniform use within EPA, and if that is what they were doing, I would not be standing before you today. But as I came to know all too well as I worked with former Chairman Lamar Smith and while serving as chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology's Subcommittee on Environment in the last Congress, the reality is different.

Over the past decade, IRIS has been repeatedly criticized by the National Academy of Sciences and the Government Accountability Office for its lack of transparency and improper use of scientific methods, which have led to some significantly flawed risk assessments over the years. In fact, GAO first added IRIS to its list of government programs that are highly vulnerable to waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in 2009. In the decades since, IRIS has made very few steps towards significant improvement.

I strongly believe that instead of allowing a flawed and poorly managed agency like IRIS to continue to operate, we should return chemical assessments to the relevant program offices within the EPA itself.

In the last Congress, I introduced legislation to achieve the reforms I have outlined. That bill was reported out of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee last fall. I have reintroduced that bill again in this session, but it is laying in the Science Committee without further action.

I believe that until there is a root-and-branch reform of the chemical assessments process at the EPA, we simply cannot allow IRIS to spread misinformation to the public as it is doing now

I urge all Members to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I would like to clear up a little bit of information.

There was a time a short while ago where the National Academy of Sciences asked the EPA, under the IRIS program, to tighten up their process. It needed fixing. It needed adjusting.

The Agency reacted. They got an A-plus rating from the scientists now. So the fine-tuning that was unnecessary to make this good program even greater happened.

But what this amendment would do is it would prohibit the EPA from funding the Integrated Risk Information System. Now, the Integrated Risk Information System, or IRIS, is an electronic base containing information on human health effects that may result from exposure to various chemicals in the environment.

This was developed by the EPA's staff with consistent information to uniform risk assessments and regulatory decisionmaking with respect to health effects from exposures to chemicals found in the environment.

There is a chemical right now that has captured the attention of people all across the United States, in fact, across the world, and it is PFOS.

We need now, more than ever, to be laser focused, working with IRIS to do everything we can to get the data and the information so we know the health effects from being exposed to these chemicals for both military and civilian people all across the United States. It is a very serious problem, and IRIS' program review process is widely considered to be a gold standard when it comes to accessing chemical toxicity.

Now, it is based on extensive scientific literature; it is peer-reviewed; and IRIS' toxicity assessments are relied upon by programs at the EPA and across the Federal Government, by States, and it is because of the high quality of the assessments.

Because these assessments assess risk across a variety of exposure paths, assessments can inform regulatory decisionmaking across all media offices in the EPA. So they can look at it holistically and be making very informed decisions.

It is no surprise, Mr. Chair, that the chemical industry has long sought to undermine the IRIS program. From their point of view, the less the public knows about the risk from toxic chemicals, the more money the chemical industry can make. We ought to be looking out for the safety and welfare of the American people, not the bottom line polluters who profit from pollution.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I just want to clarify for those in the Chamber who may not be aware, IRIS is an information-collecting entity, not a regulator. If IRIS were eliminated, EPA would still maintain an office of research and development, which would perform chemical assessments in coordination with a specialized program office within the Agency. What will compromise public safety is a poorly run government office spreading misinformation.

I also want to point out that both the nonpartisan NAS and GAO have repeatedly criticized IRIS over the past 10 years. Even the few NAS and GAO recognitions of improvements to IRIS over the years have been strongly tempered by caveats that far more work needs to be done.

For instance, the 2018 NAS report, which has been cited, suggests that IRIS still has not produced a basic handbook to guide its operations, even though that recommendation was made more than 4 years ago. This agency has been in existence since 1986 without a handbook, a basic handbook.

Just to add a little bit more color to this debate, here is an example of how absurd IRIS risk assessments can be. It sets the risk value of the chemical ethylene oxide, which is often used to sterilize medical equipment, at 100 parts quadrillion. That is a 1 with 15 zeros behind it. That value is 19,000 times less than the naturally occurring level of ethylene oxide in the human body. For perspective, OSHA sets the risk level for ethylene oxide at one point per million, which is a vastly higher threshold than IRIS itself.

I can speak similarly about flawed IRIS risk assessments related to formaldehyde or acetone, a substance found naturally in breast milk.

To sum up, absurdly assessed risk either creates unwarranted public panic or cynical disregard. Neither outcome creates a safer society.

Even worse, if IRIS is overly focused on evaluating the safety of low-risk or, in some cases, effectively no-risk chemicals, then it is likely to be distracted from assessing truly dangerous substances.

Again, I invite my colleagues to support this very important laser-focused amendment. We are not overly broad here. We are focusing on one program that has been completely—not repudiated, but certainly been highly criticized by the National Academy of Science and the GAO.

I urge my fellow Members to support this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 167 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 167 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to conduct or authorize any person to conduct geological or geophysical exploration for oil or gas, pursuant to section 11(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1340(a)), in any area located in the Atlantic Region Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas, as such planning areas are defined in the 2017-2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Proposed Final Program described in the notice entitled ''Notice of Availability of the 2017-2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Final Program,'' published by the Department of the Interior in the Federal Register on November 23, 2018 (81 Fed. Reg. 84,612); or

(2) to prepare or supplement an Environmental Impact Statement or Environmental Assessment, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.), and its associated regulations, for any such exploration.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my straightforward, commonsense amendment to the Interior-Environment appropriations bill that would prevent BOEM from issuing permits for seismic exploration in the Atlantic Ocean.

South Carolinians have made it explicitly clear where we stand on this issue. Far too much is at stake in our State. South Carolina's tourism economy is worth $22.6 billion a year, and two-thirds of that comes from the coast.

While folks may disagree about the amount of oil deposits that exist in the Atlantic Ocean, most would agree that the amount of oil off the coast of South Carolina is minimal and far less than the amount of revenue that the State brings in from tourism, recreation, and commercial fishing.

Put simply, the people of the Lowcountry understand that the risk isn't worth the reward. Or, as may grandmother said: ''The juice ain't worth the squeeze.''

Our beaches, our economy are not for sale.

And it is not just South Carolina that feels this way. It is Florida. It is Virginia. It is New Hampshire. It is North Carolina. It is Pennsylvania. It is New Jersey, Oregon, and Washington. From coast to coast, communities have made it clear that they do not want to put the marine ecosystems and their coastal livelihoods at risk, which is why so many of my colleagues from all over the country have joined me in sponsoring this amendment.

Seismic exploration is incredibly dangerous in its own right. Seismic air guns create an underwater blast louder than all but military-grade explosives. Companies fire air guns as often as every 10 seconds for days, weeks, to months on end. This can have impacts across the entire ecosystem, from marine mammals to fish to plankton.

But beyond that, seismic exploration is a major step towards this administration's ultimate goal of seeing drilling rigs up and down the Atlantic coast. High-ranking officials have said it clear as day: The only reason they are working so hard on these seismic permits is so they can open up the Atlantic to drilling by the highest bidder.

Drilling in the Atlantic would put the health of our ocean and our coastal economy at risk, and it is a massive investment in a future of dirty and dangerous offshore drilling that an overwhelming majority of people from both parties all along the Atlantic Coast oppose. I stand with them in opposition to both seismic testing and oil drilling. Far too much is at stake.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, we had the same discussion yesterday. Once again, these are offshore leases that are part of the American public's domain, not the State of South Carolina or California or Massachusetts or Florida. I understand that application.

But, once again, we also have heard that we want to have responsible renewable energy, so we are actually predisposing no seismic aspect. Well, how do you actually look at moorings in regard to subsurface anchors if you didn't use seismic activity? That is contradicting all the way around the aspect here.

Once again, this just shows that we want nothing of the sort: no seismic, no wind, no solar, no oil and gas. That is unbelievable.

If this is the kind of attitude that we want going forward, those in Arizona and the Western States that have public lands ought to be getting a lot more say in those applications.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. And when we start looking at it, maybe what we ought to do, if we are talking about oil spills, one of the worst ways to actually import oil is through boats. So maybe we ought to disallow ships, because a ship that has an accident is one oil spill away from anywhere.

So this just begs my indifference in regards to what the heck we are trying to do here. It is looking at our assets. We have a due diligence to the American people to look at those assets for public assets.

□ 1600

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, respectfully, I would disagree with Mr. GOSAR. South Carolinians have the opportunity to say what goes on off of South Carolina's coast. Voters have made it very clear on this issue.

This is not Democrat or a Republican issue. This is an issue that has been supported by Republican Governor McMaster, who has made it clear that he opposes offshore drilling.

I would ask that my conservative Members of this body, that that conservative idealogy also translates to conserving our natural resources, and for that idea of federalism to extend to offshore drilling so that States have a say. And States have spoken in South Carolina, and other States as well.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, let's break this apart a little bit. So my friend from South Carolina has proposed this amendment because he wants to protect the environment.

Well, let's look at what happens when you do this.

My friend sat in the House Committee on Natural Resources where we had experts, not people standing here behind the microphone, but real experts who came to the Congress, who testified before us, and who said: We have looked at this issue when you stop producing energy domestically. We have looked at it. And what happens when you stop producing it domestically? You import it. You import it from foreign countries.

All right. So, one, you are not stopping the production of energy. You are just doing it in another country, and you are paying them and creating jobs there.

Number two, when you do this, you still have to actually ship the energy. It doesn't just pop up in the socket. You have to ship the energy.

Look at the studies. Look at the reports. You have a greater chance of threatening your global environment, threatening the coast of South Carolina by transporting it by ship.

Look at the statistics. It is safer to do exploration and production activities, to put it in a pipe in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, my friend was there and heard the witnesses talk about this. It is important that we make sure that we are doing things that don't just feel good, but things that will actually achieve the goal of protecting our environment in the United States. This amendment is flawed.

Now, look. The other thing, Mr. Chairman, I think is important is what this prohibits is it prohibits us from actually doing a resource assessment. Maybe there is an assessment and it is determined that it doesn't make sense to produce energy there. Well, let's make an informed decision.

Last thing, Mr. Chairman, is about ecological productivity. Off the coast of Louisiana, where we reproduce somewhere between 80 and 90 percent of all of the offshore energy, the conventional energy in the United States in Federal waters, we have the second most productive fisheries in the Nation, only behind Alaska, another State that does offshore energy production. We have multiple times more fisheries than my friend's home State of South Carolina.

So the whole ecological productivity argument is just not supported by the facts. If you support the environment, if you support ecological productivity, if you support American jobs, you oppose this amendment. If you support Russian gas, if you support Vladimir Putin, if you support a dirtier environment, I urge you to vote in support of this amendment.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues, again, especially my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans, who have supported this amendment and who have supported H.R. 1941, as well. I thank my colleagues, my conservatives, who support conservation.

Mr. Chair, I would urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this bipartisan commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 168 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 168 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 235, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000) (reduced by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I want to recognize the great work of Chairwoman MCCOLLUM in finding ways to increase funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The chairwoman and members of the committee have shown a strong commitment to this important program, and I applaud their efforts.

One of the first things that Congress did was pass into law the bipartisan lands package, which permanently authorized the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This demonstrated what we can achieve when we work together on behalf of our constituents.

LWCF not only promotes access to our public lands, but helps ensure all Americans can utilize these publicly owned resources. It is important that we build off that bipartisan work by making sure that this important program receives the funding it deserves in our final spending bill.

LWCF provides hundreds of millions of dollars to States that are challenged with coastal erosion, loss of open space, and trying to balance a need to protect species habitat with urban growth demands.

It also supports our States and communities by funding stateside programs that promote recreation, responsible community development, and provide opportunities to get Americans outdoors.

When LWCF was created, it was agreed that funding from oil and gas development would be used to achieve conservation objectives across the country. This program balances resource development with conservation and opens access to our public lands for hunters, anglers, and back country users.

I strongly support LWCF, and I appreciate the efforts my colleagues have made to secure the future of this program. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of my amendment, as well as the underlying bill.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, once again, I have been sitting on the floor. I sat in the House Committee on Natural Resources yesterday and heard this assault on oil and gas. So I want to remind everybody that the only mechanism to fund LWCF is actually these funds from the Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas.

It is amazing. It is absolutely amazing that we have this rhetorical conversation on the House floor.

So we are against adding any access to know what the resource actually is by seismic. We are responsible on behalf of these resources to the American public. Yes, the American public actually owns these jurisdictions. And what we are doing is we are leveraging as that opportunity to fund LWCF.

Be careful, Will Robinson, what you are asking for.

Those responsible applications, we heard it over and over from the gentleman from Louisiana. Once again, these are an asset of the American people, not South Carolina, not Florida, not California, not Massachusetts. So responsible applications here, we have got to be taking in good stewardship.

So with that in mind, I caution everybody that LWCF is the only mechanism for funding. The only mechanism for funding is these Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leases.

These are responsible aspects, and they actually know what the resources are. You are going to need seismic, if you are going to look at alternative energy aspects, particularly wind, in regards to permanent moorings.

So from that standpoint, I just offer a cautionary plea. Be careful what you ask for. You may end up having no funding at all.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlemen from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), my esteemed colleague.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my distinguished colleague from

South Carolina for his leadership on this amendment.

With respect to the Member from Arizona, I, given his comments, look forward to him voting for this amendment as well. It is an incredibly important amendment, and, ultimately, this program has been our Nation's premier conservation program for over 50 years.

I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee for their work to reprioritize the program after the President's budget actually proposed drastic cuts to LWCF. As a result of their efforts, the bill before us today would provide the highest level of funding for the program in 17 years.

I have the great honor of representing the State of Colorado, and I have seen firsthand the benefits that LWCF brings to our State. Colorado received $278 million in LWCF funding over the last decades, including for a variety of areas in my district: Rocky Mountain National Park, Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests, to name just a few.

LWCF not only conserves critical land; it is an investment in outdoor recreation economies. Studies have shown that every dollar invested in the LWCF is $4 in economic value from natural resource goods and services.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina for bringing forth this amendment. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for their commitment to the Land and Water Conservation Fund and for joining me in offering this commonsense amendment.

Mr. Chair, I would urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 176 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 176 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior to conduct oil and gas leasing, preleasing, or related activities in the Washington/Oregon, Northern California, Central California, and Southern California Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I am offering an amendment to make it clear to the administration that we will not sit idly by as they attempt to open up our shores to further oil and gas development. We will not allow our treasured natural resources to be sold to Big Oil, and we will not put corporate profits above protecting our environment and our local coastal economies.

My amendment would put in place a moratorium on offshore oil and gas drilling and related activities in the four planning areas off the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf for fiscal year 2020.

My constituents on the central Coast have seen firsthand the devastating impacts of some of the largest oil spills in California history, like the 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill. Most recently, the 2015 Plains All American oil spill in my district cost $92 million to clean up. These incidents show us that we cannot afford yet another disastrous oil spill.

In contrast, California's coastal region generates over $1.9 trillion of GDP and supports more than $731 billion in wages.

Future oil drilling would pose a direct threat to our local economies, businesses, and tourism, which are tied to our clean oceans and healthy ecosystem.

Since the 1969 oil spill in Santa Barbara, there has not been a new or expanded lease in California State waters, or one in Federal waters since 1984.

This policy has enjoyed support from both Republican and Democratic administrations. Yet this administration today seems tone deaf to this reality. Instead, they are asking to hold seven new lease sales in the four planning areas off the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf.

I urge passage of my amendment, which would protect nearly 650,000 jobs in our region.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. CARBAJAL, my good friend, for his leadership on this amendment.

I am proud to cosponsor this amendment which would prohibit future oil and gas sales off the West Coast, including my beautiful home State of Washington.

The fact is the people of Washington State don't support drilling off our coast. Our commercial and recreational fishermen who generate billions in economic impact for our State don't want to see our fisheries compromised by another disaster like the 1988 spill which released more than 230,000 gallons of oil and affected over 110 miles of our coastline.

The 17 Native American Tribes who have fished throughout the Puget Sound watershed since time immemorial don't want to see our coastline exposed to these harmful and polluting activities.

Our shellfish growers, who support roughly 3,200 jobs in our State, don't want to see their jobs threatened. They saw how the Deepwater Horizon spill devastated Louisiana's coastal economy.

□ 1615

Coastal towns including Ocean Shores, Westport, Aberdeen, Hoquiam, Montesano, Long Beach, and Ilwaco have passed resolutions saying they don't want it.

Even former Department of the Interior Secretary Zinke in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee last year admitted that the oil and gas industry doesn't want to drill off the coast of Washington because there aren't the resources or infrastructure to do it.

He also said, ''I think I'm going to mark down Washington as opposed to drilling.''

Mr. Chair, I believe this body ought to mark Washington State down as off-limits to drilling, and this amendment does that.

This matters to our economy. It matters to our region's identity. The survival of the last 76 southern resident orca left in the world depends on keeping the Puget Sound protected from the harmful impacts of oil and gas development.

There is a lot at stake here. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the will of the residents of the State of Washington and pass this amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting Chair. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, we don't need a moratorium off the coast of California. We actually need a resurgence in domestic energy development offshore.

I heard from the gentleman that the last oil spill was in 1969. Let's see, it is 2019. Fifty years later, technology has been much different.

While the local demand for oil in California has dropped over the last 40 years, foreign dependence has increased from 5 percent to 57 percent.

In 2018, California imported 135 million barrels of oil from Saudi Arabia alone. According to the national offshore energy industry, leasing in the 240 million acres of currently off-limits areas would support an additional 165,000 jobs and inject $15 billion in annual contributions to the economy.

There are already 23 active oil platforms in Federal waters adjacent to California. Once again, let me repeat, there are 23 active oil platforms in Federal waters adjacent to California. These platforms produced nearly 17,000 barrels of oil per day in 2016 and

brought in $32.8 million in total royalties in fiscal year 2016. In a State that is importing 57.5 percent of its refined oil from foreign nations, it is imperative that we take the opportunity to utilize domestic energy supply.

Once again, let's highlight that: 57.5 percent is from overseas, which is much dirtier than what we produce here. If we are concerned about climate change and emissions, we ought to be importing less and looking at what we actually do.

Last but not least, I would like to remind everybody that we just had a conversation on the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is funded exclusively by Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas. Once again, the people who don't want this for their States, maybe they should turn down LWCF funding because it seems contradictory to the conversation.

Once again, I remind my colleagues that Federal waters belong to the U.S. people, not the States of California, Florida, South Carolina, or Massachusetts. We have a due diligence to look at the management of those resources.

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

Mr. CARDENAS. Mr. Chair, clearly, my colleague from Arizona was not paying attention. The last oil spill was in 2014.

Again, I will state that what we need to be doing is weaning ourselves off fossil fuels and investing in renewable energy like most progressive countries are doing.

The West Coast, California, and the coast of the 24th Congressional District cannot tolerate another oil spill. The benefits of oil exploration and development off our coasts do not outweigh the risks. We need to keep that in mind. For a Representative from the State of Arizona, which is landlocked, which hasn't experienced the perils of such oil spills to their economy, their workers, or their jobs, keep that in mind.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, yes, I am landlocked by California, but you know the old adage. I am waiting for oceanfront property in Arizona, as the song goes.

Once again, let's take a look at this. When we start talking about offshore assets for the Outer Continental Shelf, there is less jurisdiction with regard to that versus what we do on-shore. If we are giving this type of leverage to States with offshore assets, we ought to be giving those States like Arizona, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and Montana more jurisdictions because the law is better on their side than it is with those on offshore.

Once again, I find it interesting that we have a dichotomy here. We are all for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but we are unwilling to look at the resources it takes and where they are derived from to make sure that that is permanently, in perpetuity, funded.

Mr. Chair, I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 187 OFFERED BY MS. HILL OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 187 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 272, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,000,000)''.

Page 267, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 310, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 310, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 314, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Chair, it is hard to overstate the devastating effects of lengthening fire seasons across the United States, especially in my home State of California.

I represent three diverse valleys in California's 25th Congressional District, across northern Los Angeles and Ventura County, and all of them have had significant wildfires and forest fires in the last year.

In fact, 2018 was the deadliest fire season in California's history. According to CAL FIRE and the National Interagency Fire Center, 8,527 fires burned a total of 1,893,913 acres, the largest area on record.

Not only are these fires larger and more frequent, but they are also hotter and more intense. Soon, the term ''fire tornadoes'' will be a phrase that many people are familiar with.

My own house was evacuated last summer. We had to trailer my horse and relocate my goats and dogs to my sister's house. My sister's house was evacuated shortly thereafter. Sadly, this is not the first time I or my family has had to evacuate. It has practically become a common occurrence for people in areas like ours.

Two days after I found out that I would be coming to Washington to represent my community, three people died in the Woolsey fire, part of which burned through my district in Simi Valley.

We have to do more. I am thankful for the opportunity to put forth this amendment that provides additional funds for wildland fire management and hazardous fuels work. I am offering it to highlight the funding that is already in this bill to prepare for, combat, and reduce the risk of future catastrophic wildfires and to make sure we do more.

These funds are critical because when the Forest Service does not have enough fire suppression funds, they have to borrow from mitigation accounts to pay for fire suppression activities. This fire borrowing delays the very activities that improve forest health and reduce wildfire risk.

We cannot simply treat the effects. We have to treat the cause. But prevention takes funding, and that is why this bill and this amendment are so important.

For the first time, this bill includes $2.25 billion in fire cap adjusted funds. These additional funds ensure that our firefighters will have the resources they need to combat wildfires without fire borrowing, meaning that we will invest in the prevention solutions that we know work.

However, we will only have the cap adjusted funds for 2 years. We must all work together to ensure that any budget agreement includes fire cap adjusted funds for future budget years as well. That is how we can make lasting change on this front.

For my community, for California, and for States across the country experiencing the devastating effects of wildfires, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment, and I thank the gentlewoman from California for bringing it forward.

This bill provides substantial funding to prevent and suppress wildfires. For the first time, this bill includes $2.25 billion in cap adjusted fire suppression funding, for a total of $5.2 billion for wildland fire management.

Forest Service research and development is increased by $10 million to advance the understanding of wildland fires and climate adaptation.

While the administration proposed to eliminate the Joint Fire Science Program, this bill includes funding at the fiscal year 2019 enacted level of $6 million.

Hazardous fuels is $27 million more.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues that we only have the fire cap adjusted funds for 2 years. We must ensure that any budget agreement includes the fire cap adjusted funds in future budget years. These critical funds will allow the Forest Service to fight wildland fires without borrowing from nonfire programs.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman's efforts to reduce the risk of

catastrophic wildfires, and I support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL).

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

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 190 OFFERED BY MS. SCHRIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 190 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize the proposed revised supplemental ''appropriate and necessary'' finding in the proposed rule entitled ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units—Reconsideration of Supplemental Finding and Residual Risk and Technology Review'' published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on February 7, 2019 (84 Fed. Reg. 2670).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak on my amendment prohibiting funds from being used to undermine the EPA's Mercury and Air Toxics Standards, or MATS.

These regulations have been implemented by the power sector and have protected children and communities from mercury, lead, arsenic, and other air toxics from power plants for the past 7 years.

Furthermore, the administration's proposal to jeopardize mercury standards isn't even supported by the power industry. They have already spent billions to comply, and major power sectors and labor groups have asked that the standards be left in place and that the EPA does not move forward with its proposal to undermine them.

Finalized in 2012, the EPA recognized the significant public health benefits of MATS. Then, the EPA estimated that MATS would yield up to $90 billion in public health benefits each year. Now, MATS is fully implemented and has shown to be lifesaving, preventing more than 11,000 premature deaths every year and 130,000 asthma attacks each year.

As a pediatrician, I have seen firsthand the impact of air pollution on our children. Pregnant women and children are particularly vulnerable when they are exposed to heavy metals, which impact the central nervous system with potentially devastating effects on neural development.

What we are talking about here is a known public health risk to millions of people. We cannot abandon a policy that has already been proven to work and save lives. MATS has already been shown to prevent premature deaths, adverse effects on pregnant women and children, and health problems like asthma.

It is critical that we protect our children and families from the well-documented health risks posed by mercury and heavy metals and prohibit taxpayer dollars from being used to roll back these safeguards.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment from the gentlewoman from Washington to block the Trump administration from trying to weaken Mercury and Air Toxics Standards for power plants.

Power plants across the country, as has been pointed out, have already complied with the rule. In fact, they have been doing it since 2012, and it has given huge health benefits.

□ 1630

The power sector opposes what the Trump EPA is trying to do, unions oppose what the Trump EPA is trying to do, and so do States and public health communities.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this amendment forward, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, the EPA's announcement in late December intended to revise the cost-benefit findings behind the MATS aspects and benefits. The Obama-era EPA's own estimate of the cost implementing MATS exceeded its estimate of benefits by 1,233 to 2,400 times, an absurdity papered over by the accounting trick of double counting as co-benefits reductions in nonmercury emissions as though these reductions were already achieved under other regulations.

The financial costs of this implementation are between $4 to $5 million annually—no, I am sorry—$9.5 billion annually.

Once again, the rule hasn't even been put out yet.

Don't you think we ought to be waiting to find out what the actual rule is before we say no go?

Because we don't even know where it goes.

We also want to take a look at catastrophic wildfires. Catastrophic wildfires are the largest aspect in regard to contaminants into the air as we witnessed in hazardous breathing times, particularly in Montana and California. So from that standpoint, I urge a ''no'' vote against this one because it is premature to actually what the rule is coming out.

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

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chairman, I would simply request that my opposition, my colleague, double check his facts. This is well-documented. This is effective. It is cost saving, and the costs have already been paid by the energy sector. This is something that they do not even want to see rolled back.

Mr. Chairman, it protects public health. I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER).

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

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 194 will not be offered.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the request for a recorded vote on amendments en bloc No. 5 offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) be withdrawn to the end that the question be put de novo.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The request for a recorded vote is withdrawn.

The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise along with Mr. JOYCE to thank our staff on both sides of the aisle and also our personal offices for all of the work they have done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in support of increasing the productivity of our national forestland. Somehow, America is the world's number two importer of lumber, and at the same time our forests continue to burn at an unprecedented rate. We need to get our forests back in working order.

The majority provided $276 million for forest products, which is an increase of $7 million above the enacted level and $4 million below the President's budget request.

My amendment would support job growth and increased timber production to support forest health and promote safe communities. This funding is critical to support the President's executive order on forest management that involves a plan to sell 3.7 billion board feet of timber and improve over 1.1 million acres of national forestland to mitigate wildfire risk.

Right now there are 150 million dead trees just in my home State of California. If we don't act now to dedicate more resources toward timber management, we won't have any forest left to manage. Instead, we will be watching them burn, foul the air, and foul our water with ash; and in the meantime, we are still importing wood products.

For example, as a result of the 2018 Carr fire in West Redding, California, which burned approximately 230,000 acres and eight people lost their lives, we also lost the Whiskeytown National Recreation Area encompassing 318 square miles which burned to the ground.

We need to increase the pace and scale of forest production and wildfire mitigation in a way that makes business sense and includes the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, 62 percent of forestlands in my district are federally owned. The remaining private forests in my district generate 73,000 jobs, contribute $4 billion in manufacturing and sales and supports $1.7 billion in payroll.

There should be no reason our Federal forests cannot produce the same benefits and results to its employees and community as the private sector can.

Let's focus on protecting public health, creating jobs, enjoying the great outdoors by reducing fire risks, and generating economic growth to rural communities across the U.S.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the House for passage of my amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM) having assumed the chair, Mr. HIMES, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1649

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LARSEN of Washington) at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 445 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3055.

Will the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1650

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, with Ms. NORTON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendments en bloc No. 5 offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LARSEN of Washington). Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116–119 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. RUTHERFORD of Florida.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 36 by Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

Amendment No. 70 by Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

Amendment No. 85 by Ms. STEVENS of Michigan.

Amendment No. 89 by Ms. UNDERWOOD of Illinois.

Amendment No. 99 by Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

Amendment No. 105 by Mr. PENCE of Indiana.

Amendment No. 114 by Ms. SPANBERGER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 128 by Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ of Florida.

Amendment No. 132 by Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 133 by Mr. BUCHANAN of Florida.

Amendment No. 135 by Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 136 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 139 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 143 by Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 147 by Mr. MULLIN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 148 by Mr. MULLIN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 158 by Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 161 by Mr. HICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 163 by Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

Amendment No. 165 by Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.

Amendment No. 167 by Mr. CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 168 by Mr. CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 176 by Mr. CARBAJAL of California.

Amendment No. 187 by Ms. HILL of California.

Amendment No. 190 by Ms. SCHRIER of Washington.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RUTHERFORD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 245, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 368]

AYES—186

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Crawford
Crist
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
Demings
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Frankel
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Johnson (LA)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kim
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Lawson (FL)
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luria
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
Meadows
Meuser
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Radewagen
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rouzer
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Shalala
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Soto
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Vela
Wagner
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—245

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Balderson
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Clyburn
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (MO)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Haaland
Hartzler
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stewart
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wilson (FL)
Wittman

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

□ 1726

Messrs. KENNEDY, JEFFRIES, KHANNA, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MORELLE, Mses. HAALAND, PRESSLEY, Mr. McEACHIN, Ms. HOULAHAN, Messrs. BOST, ROY, ARRINGTON, LONG, PAYNE, and DAVID SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. PENCE, YARMUTH, COHEN, VELA, HARDER of California, Ms. FRANKEL, Messrs. GROTHMAN, and SMITH of Missouri changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. MASSIE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''present.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 240, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 369]

AYES—192

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—240

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio

DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radewagen
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1731

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 267, noes 165, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 370]

AYES—267

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Armstrong
Axne
Bacon
Balderson
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Graves (GA)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mitchell
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radewagen
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Rogers (AL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Steube
Stevens
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Waltz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young

NOES—165

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Gallagher
Gohmert
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Ratcliffe
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Rutherford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1735

Mrs. RADEWAGEN changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. BANKS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 135, noes 296, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 371]

AYES—135

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Crawford
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gooden
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Massie
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Timmons
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wittman
Woodall
Wright
Yoho

NOES—296

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allred
Armstrong
Axne
Babin
Baird
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gottheimer
Granger
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Stivers
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Stevens
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1739

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. GOLDEN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 84, noes 345, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 372]

AYES—84

Abraham
Aderholt
Amodei
Baird
Balderson
Biggs
Bost
Brown (MD)
Buck
Byrne
Calvert
Cline
Cloud
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Courtney
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Dunn
Finkenauer
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gianforte
Golden
Gosar
Green (TN)
Harris
Hice (GA)
Horn, Kendra S.
Huizenga
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (PA)
Lamb
Larsen (WA)
Lesko
Massie
McCarthy
McClintock
Meadows
Meuser
Mitchell
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Norcross
Nunes
Palmer
Perry
Pingree
Reschenthaler
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Roy
Scalise
Sensenbrenner
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Stauber
Stefanik
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Vela
Wagner
Walorski
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wittman
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NOES—345

Adams
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin

Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller
Moolenaar
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norman
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radewagen
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rooney (FL)
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Steil
Stivers
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho

NOT VOTING—9

Bishop (UT)
Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Plaskett
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1743

Ms. DELAURO changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chair, on roll call no. 372, I mistakenly voted "no" when I intended to vote "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chair, on roll call no. 372, I mistakenly voted "yes" when I intended to vote "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MS. STEVENS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 381, noes 50, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 373]

AYES—381

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allred
Armstrong
Axne
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Dunn
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norton
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radewagen
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOES—50

Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Banks
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Cheney
Cloud
Comer
Davidson (OH)
Duncan
Ferguson
Fulcher
Gallagher
González-Colón (PR)
Graves (GA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hice (GA)
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
LaHood
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Massie
McClintock
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Norman
Palazzo
Palmer
Ratcliffe
Rice (SC)
Rose, John W.
Roy
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Walker
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Yoho
Young

NOT VOTING—7

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1746

Mrs. RADEWAGEN changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MS. UNDERWOOD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 194, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 374]

AYES—238

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—194

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1750

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. BANKS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 113, noes 318, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 375]

AYES—113

Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Biggs
Bilirakis
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Collins (GA)
Comer
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Duncan
Estes
Ferguson
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gooden
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Miller
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Ratcliffe
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smucker
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Timmons
Walker
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wittman
Woodall
Wright
Yoho

NOES—318

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Armstrong
Axne
Bacon
Baird
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Dunn
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Guest
Haaland
Hagedorn
Hartzler
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko

Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mitchell
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radewagen
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roby
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Stevens
Stivers
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Omar
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. JACKSON LEE) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1754

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Chair, during Roll Call Vote number 375 on H.R. Banks Amendment No. 99, I mistakenly recorded my vote as yes when I should have voted no.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 425, noes 6, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

AYES—425

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Norton
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radewagen
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—6

Amash
Biggs
Porter
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—7

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Huizenga
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1758

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 408, noes 22, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

AYES—408

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Norton
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radewagen
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—22

Amash
Barr
Biggs
Budd
Burgess
Foxx (NC)
Gaetz
Gosar
Green (TN)
Hice (GA)
Jordan
Long
Massie
Palmer
Porter
Posey
Rooney (FL)
Roy
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Webster (FL)
Wright

NOT VOTING—8

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Lucas
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)
Walker

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1801

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 377.

Mr. BARR. Madam Chair, on rollcall no. 377, I mistakenly voted "no" when I intended to vote "yes".

AMENDMENT NO. 128 OFFERED BY MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 178, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

AYES—252

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Dunn
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Golden
Gomez
González-Colón (PR)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steube
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)

Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOES—178

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Steil
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young

NOT VOTING—8

Emmer
Graves (GA)
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Radewagen
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1805

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 132 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 185, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

AYES—247

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Zeldin

NOES—185

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Young

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1809

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 133 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 192, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

AYES—239

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kuster (NH)
LaHood
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—192

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón (PR)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jeffries
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Napolitano
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Pocan
Posey
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Speier
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1814

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam chair, on roll call no. 380, I mistakenly voted "no" when I intended to vote "yes."

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Chair, during roll call vote number 380 on Buchanan Amendment number 133, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "nay" when I should have voted "yea".

Stated against:

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Chair, on roll call no. 380, I mistakenly voted "yes" when I intended to vote "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 135 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 240, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

AYES—192

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—240

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright

Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1818

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 136 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 188, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—243

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Riggleman
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOES—188

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young

NOT VOTING—7

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Radewagen
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1821

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 139 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 254, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

AYES—178

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young

NOES—254

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1825

Mr. REED changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 143 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 233, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—198

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—233

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow

Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Payne
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1830

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 147 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 241, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

AYES—191

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—241

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1833

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 148 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 243, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

AYES—189

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—243

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1838

Ms. GARCIA of Texas changed her vote from ''no'' on ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Chair, during Roll Call Vote number No. 386 on Mullin Amendment 148, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yea" when I should have voted "nay."

AMENDMENT NO. 158 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 239, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

AYES—193

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—239

Adams
Aguilar
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette

DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Golden
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1841

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 161 OFFERED BY MR. HICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 128, noes 304, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—128

Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Crawford
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Flores
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Miller
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Norman
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Ratcliffe
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thornberry
Timmons
Wagner
Walker
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wittman
Woodall
Wright
Yoho

NOES—304

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Baird
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón (PR)
Gottheimer
Granger
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norton
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radewagen
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1845

Mrs. RADEWAGEN changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 163 OFFERED BY MR. BANKS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 132, noes 299, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

AYES—132

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Crawford
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gooden
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McHenry
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Thornberry
Timmons
Wagner
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wittman
Woodall
Wright
Yoho

NOES—299

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allred
Armstrong
Axne
Baird
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gottheimer
Granger
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mitchell
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radewagen
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Stevens
Stivers
Suozzi
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
McClintock
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1848

Ms. UNDERWOOD changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. TAYLOR, Madam Chair, on roll call no. 389, I mistakenly voted Nay when I intended to vote Yea.

AMENDMENT NO. 165 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 275, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

AYES—157

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McClintock
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Wagner
Walker
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho

NOES—275

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moolenaar
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1852

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 167 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 187, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

AYES—245

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
García (IL)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOES—187

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garamendi
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1856

Mmes. JACKSON LEE and TLAIB changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 168 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 325, noes 107, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

AYES—325

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Axne
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Dunn
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gottheimer
Graves (MO)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Guest
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radewagen
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Riggleman
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stivers
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NOES—107

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Banks
Biggs
Bishop (UT)
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Duffy
Duncan
Estes
Ferguson
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gohmert
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Holding
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Keller
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McClintock
Meadows
Mullin
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Ratcliffe
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rose, John W.
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Thornberry
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Williams
Wright
Yoho

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1901

Ms. RADEWAGEN changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 176 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 192, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

AYES—238

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Golden
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOES—192

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett

Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young

NOT VOTING—8

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Palazzo
Ryan
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1904

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 187 OFFERED BY MS. HILL OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 377, noes 55, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

AYES—377

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allred
Armstrong
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Dunn
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norton
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radewagen
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young

NOES—55

Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Balderson
Banks
Biggs
Bishop (UT)
Brooks (AL)
Budd
Burchett
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Crawford
Davidson (OH)
Duncan
Ferguson
Gibbs
Graves (GA)
Grothman
Harris
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Loudermilk
Marshall
Massie
Meadows
Norman
Palazzo
Palmer
Ratcliffe
Rice (SC)
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Stewart
Stivers
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Womack
Woodall
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1907

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 190 OFFERED BY MS. SCHRIER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 177, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

AYES—253

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radewagen
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Riggleman
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOES—177

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young

NOT VOTING—8

Blumenauer
Butterfield
Emmer
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Kirkpatrick
Ryan
Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1911

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Chair, I was absent today due to a family medical emergency.

Had I been present I would have voted: NAY on Roll Call No. 368; NAY on Roll Call No. 369; YEA on Roll Call No. 370; NAY on Roll Call No. 371; NAY on Roll Call No. 372; YEA on Roll Call No. 373; YEA on Roll Call No. 374; NAY on Roll Call No. 375; YEA on Roll Call No. 376; YEA on Roll Call No. 377; YEA on Roll Call No. 378; YEA on Roll Call No. 379; YEA on Roll Call No. 380; NAY on Roll Call No. 381; YEA on Roll Call No. 382; NAY on Roll Call No. 383; NAY on Roll Call No. 384; NAY on Roll Call No. 385; NAY on Roll Call No. 386; NAY on Roll Call No. 387; NAY on Roll Call No. 388; NAY on Roll Call No. 389; NAY on Roll Call No. 390; YEA on Roll Call No. 391; YEA on Roll Call No. 392; YEA on Roll Call No. 393; YEA on Roll Call No. 394; and YEA on Roll Call No. 395.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SHALALA) having assumed the chair, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1915

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2407

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor for H.R. 2407.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL POLLINATOR WEEK

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Pollinator Week. I am honored to be the Representative of three cities each named a Monarch City U.S.A.: Oak Harbor, Port Clinton, and Sandusky, Ohio. They are bestowed this title for their citizenries' efforts to support the monarch butterfly, a noble and substantial pollinator, by planting milkweed and nectar plants.

With beekeepers having lost 40 percent of their bee colonies last year, it is imperative that Congress follow my constituents' lead to protect and support pollinator populations. The 2018 farm bill and the fiscal year 2020 Agriculture appropriations bill prioritized a commitment to the welfare of pollinators for the sake of human life. The farm bill authorized the Honey Bee and Pollinator Research Coordinator, and the Appropriations Committee funded the position to strengthen our research and protect pollinators from extinction.

In the spirit of National Pollinator Week and as an honored cosponsor of the Saving America's Pollinators Act of 2019, please join me in celebrating the beauty and utility and essential presence in our environment of one of nature's finest constructs: pollinators.

RAISING AWARENESS FOR PTSD

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, during the month of June, we raise awareness for those suffering with post-traumatic stress disorder.

After trauma or a life-threatening event, it is common to have reactions such as upsetting memories, increased jumpiness, or trouble sleeping.

PTSD was not always properly understood by the medical professional and society, but today there are great organizations and resources that can help both individuals and professionals discover ways to identify and manage PTSD symptoms and explore effective treatments.

PTSD is especially prevalent for those who have served in the military, affecting nearly 30 percent of Vietnam veterans and up to 20 percent of veterans who served during the global war on terror. A nonservicemember may be exposed to a single traumatic event that can also cause PTSD.

Madam Speaker, as a former rehabilitation therapist, I have seen the incredible strides that people with injuries can make with access to appropriate rehabilitation. I applaud all the organizations that raise awareness about this important issue during the month of June. There is help and support for those who have PTSD.

HONORING EDWIN R. JONES, JR.

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, recently, the Collings Lakes Fire Department held a parade celebrating 55 years of service and dedicated a new fire truck in honor of the late deputy chief, Edwin R. Jones, Jr.

Ed took on many roles throughout his life, most of them involving him giving of himself and of his time without expecting anything but to see someone smile.

Ed began his career as a volunteer firefighter, and when he moved to Collings Lakes in Atlantic County, he joined the fire department to serve as an engineer. Throughout his 40-year career with the fire department, Ed served in many roles, including treasurer, vice president, fire commissioner, and he was serving as the deputy chief when he passed away in 2017.

Ed is remembered. He is remembered by his family, his coworkers, and his friends for being a selfless, caring presence in our community, and his loss is felt by many.

Ed was a true American hero.

PROTECTING AMERICANS WITH PREEXISTING CONDITIONS

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment in the missed opportunity this House had this week to protect individuals with preexisting conditions.

Since the Democrats took the majority in January, they have stoked fear with the American public that the administration will remove these protections; however, maintaining the current coverage requirements for those with preexisting conditions is an issue that Republicans and Democrats in this body agree on. That is why I cosponsored Congressman RODNEY DAVIS' amendment to H.R. 2740 that would have prohibited any funds at the Department of Health and Human Services from being used to weaken the existing safeguards.

However, every single Democrat on the Rules Committee voted to prevent this amendment from even being debated by the full House. Instead, they would rather continue to politicize the issue and stoke fear that these critical protections are in imminent danger of being taken away.

I urge this body to stop sowing discord on issues we agree on and to work towards bipartisan solutions that benefit the people we serve.

RECOGNIZING WAYNE METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY

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

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, it is a great honor to recognize Wayne Metropolitan Community Action Agency's After-School 21st Century Learning Centers program participants. The young people who have participated in this program have shown initiative and growth.

Wayne Metropolitan Community Action Agency has been a resource for the people of Wayne County. Their wraparound programming demonstrates an understanding that investing in our children is investing in a better future and better quality of life for all the residents in the 13th Congressional District. The young people who have participated in this program have shown determination to achieve their highest potential.

It is an honor to recognize our young people in this program and, hopefully, be able to show that they can be an investment for the future, and I acknowledge their outstanding accomplishment.

HONORING KENNETH DWYER

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Kenneth Dwyer for nearly 20 years of exceptional service to our country.

Lieutenant Colonel Dwyer started his career in the military as a Special Forces officer, where he was deployed to Afghanistan on three separate operations.

In 2006, during his third deployment, he was critically injured by a grenade, losing both his left hand and his left eye. This incident only fueled his desire to fight for his Nation.

Through his ongoing perseverance, he rose through the ranks to become commander of Hunter Army Airfield in the First Congressional District of Georgia. With Lieutenant Colonel Dwyer as head of Hunter Army Airfield, the installation won the Army Community of Excellence Award for 2019, which recognizes bases for troop morale, soldier readiness, innovation, community involvement, and more.

Lieutenant Colonel Dwyer passed the baton to Lieutenant Colonel Escobar to command Hunter Army Airfield on June 13.

Thank you, Lieutenant Colonel Dwyer for all of your hard work at Hunter and for making this an installation that everyone in the First Congressional District of Georgia can be proud of.

JUSTICE FOR JOSUE FLORES

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, for a very long time, the entire community, including his neighborhood, the Near Northside, mourned the loss of a wonderful little boy by the name of Josue Flores.

We mourn with his family members and his neighborhood. What a loving neighborhood.

We stood by the tree in the area in which he was murdered, stabbed many times. There were investigations and arrests, and then there were no arrests, and the community still mourned.

I want to applaud the Near Northside for continuing to remember Josue Flores, as well the Safe Work Coalition, ensuring that no child would ever walk home to be victimized in that neighborhood again.

Many law enforcement officers and civil rights groups and others work together, civic neighborhood groups—the Near Northside Super Neighborhood—but now there is finally an arrest. We hope that justice is rendered for that family and justice is rendered for this whole act that we hope never happens again.

We mourn him. We want it to be fair and just. But we want Josue Flores to rest in peace and want this proceeding to move forward so that this family can have peace and this neighborhood can be assured that their children can be safe again.

I will work with them continuously, as we did, to ensure that law enforcement is there for them and the community is there for them.

HONORING STEVEN F. HILLIAS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise

today to recognize the life and memory of a law enforcement professional who served the people of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, for over two decades. Steven F. Hillias, chief of police to the Perkasie Borough Police Department, passed away on Sunday at the age of 49.

Born in Allentown, Chief Hillias was a graduate of Allentown Central Catholic High School and went on to receive a degree in management from Penn State. Chief Hillias later attended the FBI National Academy and received a master's degree in criminal justice from DeSales University.

Chief Hillias joined the Perkasie Borough Police Department in 1997 and was elevated to chief of police in 2014. Well-respected in the law enforcement community, Chief Hillias was a member of the Police Chiefs Association of Bucks County and the Fraternal Order of Police.

Chief Hillias was known as an approachable, community-oriented chief who cared deeply about the Perkasie community. He worked tirelessly and with empathy to combat the opioid epidemic and advocated for young offenders in diversionary programs. He was a man admired for his fairness and his compassion.

Madam Speaker, I send my deepest condolences to Chief Hillias' wife, Tracy, and his children, Michael and Lauren. We thank them for sharing him with our community.

May Chief Hillias enjoy his eternal reward for a life he spent serving others.

CONGRATULATING PROSPER HIGH SCHOOL MEN'S LACROSSE TEAM

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Prosper High School men's lacrosse team for bringing home their first State championship title by defeating the Smithson Valley Rangers 11–5.

The team proved their ability to stay composed while overcoming obstacles under pressure. Winning is not just about talent, skill, or the type of cleats you wear. Winning is about character, on and off the field, alongside hard work and dedication to one's team. The Prosper Eagles showed their commitment to these values from the very beginning.

I know I speak on behalf of the entire community when I say the city of Prosper is beaming with pride.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Prosper High School men's lacrosse team on their successful season.

□ 1930

CELEBRATING JUNETEENTH

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise to join my friends and colleagues in celebrating Juneteenth.

Madam Speaker, 154 years ago, on June 19, 1865, Texas became the final State in the U.S. to officially abolish slavery. This was a pivotal day in American history, one that represents both the checkered past of our Nation as well as the rising above it.

September 1862, President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, and it took effect on January 1, 1863, throughout all the formerly Confederate States.

Madam Speaker, 2 years later, Texas was the last stop on the road to the abolition of slavery in America on June 19, known as Juneteenth.

On a day like Juneteenth, we encourage everyone to come together and celebrate this occasion and recognize not what makes us different from one other, but what we all have in common, all that we share: the love of freedom and individual rights that we are one people.

There is still more to be done, but a lot of progress has been made the last 150 years, and we will continue to make that together as a society.

SEVEN FACTORS IMPEDING IMPEACHMENT

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. It is a preeminent privilege to stand here and address this august body—to address those who are within the sound of my voice would probably be more appropriate—and those who are onlookers by way of various means of telecommunications. It is an honor and a privilege to do so, and I am grateful to the leadership of this House for extending and allowing the privilege. I believe that it is one of the great honors of being a Congressperson, to be able to stand and address the Nation, if you will.

So tonight, as a Member of this body, it is my honor to speak on a topic very near and dear to my heart and the hearts of a good many Americans. I would like to talk about some of the current factors that are impeding impeachment.

I have mnemonic notes that I will refer to from time to time so as to address seven different topics that are factors currently impeding impeachment.

The first that I shall address is the belief by many that not enough bipartisanship exists as it relates to impeachment, not enough persons from both sides of the aisle, and, more specifically, not enough persons who are representative of the Republican Party.

There is this belief that impeachment must be an effort that is bipartisan, and it must be to some significant amount of bipartisanship. That amount has not been announced, so it is hard to say what the significant amount of bipartisanship is that is being sought.

But I think that at this point, so as to address the question of bipartisanship, which I believe in, would hope for—I think that bipartisanship is a wonderful thing. But to address it, I believe we will have to go to Federalist 65.

For those who are interested, the Federalist Papers consists of some 85 articles that were published between 1787 and 1788, published by the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Jay. He was also assisted by the first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton. And, of course, the third part of this group of persons was Madison, the fourth President of the United States.

These persons, the three of them, the trio, were to, if you will, present reasons to the country why the Constitution should be ratified; and in presenting reasons for ratification, they published Federalist 65.

Federalist 65 explains what impeachment is all about. It does a little bit more than just explains what it is about. It explains what one might expect, what we might expect if impeachment is sought.

And I must say, at this point, that these three Framers of the Constitution were prophetic, absolutely persons who could see into the future, one might think, because they prognosticated what we are having to concern ourselves with currently in terms of what will happen among the people and in society should we move toward impeachment.

Prophetic—they had their flaws; they were not perfect; but on this issue, they seemed to have been prophetic, because they prognosticated that at a time such as this, there would be division, that you would have parties separating in their own corners, if you will, that the people among us in society, that they would have very hard opinions; that people would sometimes base their opinions upon the circumstances, and others, just based upon the knowledge that they might have of the person who is being impeached.

They prognosticated that this would not be a time of great unity, that it is more likely to be a time of division. And they knew, however, that the Constitution could survive this.

The Constitution survived the impeachment of Andrew Johnson in 1868. It was rancorous; there was a lot of divisiveness; but the Constitution survived. The Constitution is capable of surviving it, and the people, more importantly, are capable of surviving. And society is capable of surviving, which means the country can survive impeachment.

But it is there for a reason. It is there because there is a belief that, from time to time, you may have one

holding public trust in the highest office of the land, the Chief Executive Officer, known as the President. The Chief Executive Officer may engage in conduct that would cause the trust in the Chief Executive Officer to be assumed less than what it should be.

The Chief Executive Officer might breach his trust that the public has in him. The Chief Executive Officer would do harm to society, and in doing harm to society, the Framers of the Constitution concluded that there should be a means by which the Chief Executive Officer could be removed, and this, of course, would be impeachment.

Impeachment is not something that anyone relishes. We don't seek impeachment. It is sometimes forced upon us, something that you have to do if you truly believe that no one is above the law.

Let's look at some of the historic impeachment cases. There are but two: Johnson in 1868, and Clinton in 1998. And in both of these, the parties were separated. There was not a moment when the Republicans and Democrats decided: Yes, this is what we must do, and we will unite and get it done.

Andrew Johnson was not impeached, and the impeachment failed by one vote.

President Clinton was not impeached, but there was not this rush of Democrats to support Republicans to impeach President Clinton. It just didn't happen.

So an expectation of national unity is probably setting the standard so high that we may not ever impeach.

The Framers understood that there might not be this unity, probably wouldn't be, and prognosticated that unity would not exist in Federalist 65. So we are setting the bar pretty high when we decide this must be done.

By the way, no one can impose that standard upon us. That is a standard that we can accept, but it doesn't have to be a standard for the Members who would vote for impeachment. That is absolutely not the case. There is no one person who can impose such a standard on this body.

Each person has the opportunity to make up his or her mind based upon the evidence presented using the standard that he or she believes to be appropriate. So imposing a standard of national unity is probably setting the bar a bit too high.

Next, there is this notion that we should defeat, not impeach. Defeat, not impeach.

Well, we say that no one is above the law, and I have heard a good many Members of this body say so. It has been published: No one is above the law.

And usually there would be the following words thereafter: No one is above the law, and this includes the President of the United States.

Well, if no one is above the law and you believe that the President has committed impeachable acts, then you probably wouldn't want to say that we should defeat at the next election as opposed to impeach now—if no one is above the law. Because, in essence, you are saying: No one is above the law; however, I won't enforce the law. I won't honor Article II of the Constitution. No one is above the law, but I am not going to impose the law upon one who has committed impeachable acts.

I don't see the consistency in doing this, but it is the prerogative of people to do what they may. I am merely explaining some of the impediments to impeachment. This is one: Defeat, not impeach.

And if no one is above the law, as I have indicated, and I believe this—and this includes the President—then I believe we have a duty, a responsibility, and an obligation to move forward with impeachment. I don't think you wait until the next election to avoid your duty, responsibility, and obligation.

One salient point that can be made is some ugly things can happen when you have no guardrails, when you send a signal to the Chief Executive Officer that there is no one to hold you accountable, that the Congress is not going to fulfill its responsibilities under the Constitution—no guardrails.

Well, the Chief Executive Officer, who has already committed impeachable actions, will proceed probably to do what he may and will simply because he knows that he does not have the deterrent that the Congress is supposed to impose by virtue of having this awesome amount of authority to remove from him office—assuming that the President is impeached and the Senate convicts.

But, if you don't have guardrails, you don't have a Chief Executive Officer who is being deterred from doing things that we might find totally inappropriate, for example, going to war. The Chief Executive Officer could decide: I need not go to Congress to go to war. The Congress has the duty and responsibility to declare the war, but since Congress isn't going to do anything, why bother?

Congress is but another entity, not a coequal partner in the government with the executive.

So I think you can't hold the position that you will defeat, not impeach, especially when you have said, if you have, that the President has committed these impeachable actions.

Now, there are a good many people who are walking back comments. And everybody has a right to walk back comments—happens quite regularly here—but you might take note of this: You can't walk back history. You can walk back comments, but you can't walk back history.

So if you have already said that the President has committed these impeachable actions and you have already said the President should be impeached, you won't be able to walk that back from history.

Time tells and history judges. The truth is known. The truth will be published at some point about what we have said and how we have behaved.

Impeachment cannot be but a talking point to be used for political expediency. You can't on one day say, ''Oh, yes, he ought to be impeached,'' and then the next day say something that contradicts this in an effort to walk it back.

Well, you can do it, but history will record both of your comments, and history will judge you. At some point, that judgment will be codified such that the world will know what was said on all occasions, not just on the latest rendition of the commentary that is made.

Time tells; history judges. The truth will be known. Defeat, not impeach is not an option if you believe that the President has committed impeachable actions.

□ 1945

Then, there is, of course, the notion that the Senate won't convict. There is no requirement that the Senate convict. This is something that a person or some persons can require of themselves, a belief that since the Senate won't convict, there is no need to impeach. But that is not what impeachment is all about. It is about the House of Representatives doing its job.

The House does its job quite routinely here sending bills of great importance to the Senate that the Senate doesn't act on. It did so last week and will do so again and again. H.R. 1 was not acted on, and a good many others. I need not go through all of them. But the point is, you cannot conclude because it is impeachment that you have a different standard, in my opinion.

You have to have one standard. Either we are going to decide we will not send things to the Senate, and cease and desist, I suppose being the House of Representatives, which I would not abide with, but that, I suppose, would be a decision that you might make, one might make, but not one for me to make.

I think that we have a responsibility to do our jobs, and then we give the Senate the opportunity to do its job. If we do our job, we do more than simply impeach, which is important. We act as a deterrent that impeachment is to deter the next President; to let the next President know that the House of Representatives will not shy away from its responsibility; that it will do what it is supposed to do when a President commits impeachable actions.

So this notion that the Senate won't act is a reason for us not to act, would mean then that the Senate controls impeachment, which is the responsibility of the House of Representatives.

Do we want to give the Senate the authority to do its will and not have the House do its will? Do we want the Senate's will to become the will of the House? What we are saying is, until we can get a Senate that will follow our lead, we will not take the lead and do as we should, do what we, according to Article II section 4, and in my opinion, must.

We cannot allow the Senate to control the House of Representatives no more than we can allow another party, if I am on one side of the aisle and we have a party on the other side, we can't allow another party to dictate what we would do on this side of the aisle.

If you have overwhelming majority, you cannot blame the other side for your failure to act. That is my opinion. If we have an overwhelming majority, then at some point, it will be noted in history that we didn't act. And it won't be said in history that we didn't act because the minority prohibited us from acting here in the House.

It won't be said that we failed to act because the Senate had the authority to prevent us from acting. The Senate does not trump the House of Representatives. We cannot decide that only the Senate can determine whether the House should move forward. This is not what the Framers intended. But this is, in effect, what we will be doing if we predicate our actions upon the actions of the Senate.

I don't think that is appropriate and I take issue with the notion that we must wait until the Senate is ready to act before we can act.

By the way, no one knows what the Senate would do until the Senate has an opportunity to do it. Once the Senate is confronted with having to vote, we may find that the Senate will take a different course of conduct than that we have presupposed the Senate will do or take.

The Senate could very well have an epiphanous moment. Probably not, but it could, meaning some two-thirds of it, and act. But whether it does or doesn't, we have a duty to do our job and then let the Senate take a vote, go on record, and we will let the chips fall where they may in history.

I think all of us, we should all be on record. We know what the circumstances are. We know the harm that is being caused in society. We know that the trust has been breached, and we only have to now do what the Framers have given us the way to do, assuming that we have the will to do it.

They gave us the way, but they could not give us the will. We have to have the will to act ourselves. Impeachment in the Senate, where the trial is to take place, is not to be predicated upon the House following the will of the Senate.

Now, there is another reason that I would like to call to your attention, another impediment, and it is the notion that impeachment will divide our Nation. I have covered this to a limited extent, but I will go back because some things bear repeating.

In Federalist No. 65, the Framers of the Constitution made it very clear that you will not have, as they saw it at that time, this national unity. It doesn't work that way. People are going to take sides. And when they do, you are likely to have things develop along party lines. But we have to still do our job. We cannot set standards that may be impossible.

We can't have the standard be the Senate must decide it will go along with us before we will act. That is not a reasonable standard for us to have as Members of the House. We are independent. We can't have the standard that we can only do this if we have the consent of the opposing party.

What you are doing is putting the fate of the country in the hands of the minority. You are putting the fate of the country in the hands of the Senate when the House has a duty to act.

So I conclude with this on this point, the notion that it will divide the Nation is something that was prognosticated. Now, I would love to have the country in unity. I believe in unity, and I think you can have unity without uniformity. We don't all have to do the same thing all the time to have unity on certain issues.

But there is no constitutional requirement that we have the minority support what the majority can do, and the Senate be aligned with the House before the House can act. There is no constitutional requirement for such a thing.

Next, we have the notion that impeachment can benefit the Chief Executive Officer. Impeachment will benefit the Chief Executive Officer. It is hard to imagine a Chief Executive Officer wanting to be impeached.

I have seen and heard statements from the Chief Executive Officer that would give me reason to believe that the Chief Executive Officer really does not want to be impeached.

There is something called reverse psychology that we are all familiar with. Say that you want the thing that you don't want, to the extent that you convince the people who can have the impact to do the thing that you do want them to do, which is the thing that they think you don't want them to do.

My point is simply this: We cannot assume that we are walking into some sort of petard, by virtue of our taking up our constitutional responsibility. This is not a trap. This is our responsibility, and we should not allow a Chief Executive Officer to convince us that we should do this because the Chief Executive Officer thinks that it would benefit him, when, in fact, the history of impeachment seems to provide evidence to the contrary.

The history of events is that Andrew Johnson did not get reelected after he was impeached.

And for those who have been in this debate about what happened with President Clinton, I assure you, his Vice President did not get elected. One would assume that the mantle would be passed on to the Vice President. Such was not the case. He was not elected.

There are those who would say: Well, but the House of Representatives—no, the House didn't change hands. The Republicans maintained control of the House of Representatives. Well, they lost some seats. Well, they did, but they still had 218 and they controlled the House.

The point is, you cannot assume that impeachment is going to be a benefit. As a matter of fact, it is an indelible stain on the record of the Chief Executive Officer. It would be forever known, whether he is removed from office or not, that this Chief Executive Officer was impeached. It will have an impact on the Chief Executive Officer's brand. This person will forever have the brand of an impeached Chief Executive Officer.

I am not saying you do it just to brand a person. I am talking about impeachment, because we would fulfill the responsibilities under Article II section 4, which indicate that the President can be impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, bribery, treason. We would fulfill those responsibilities pursuant to Article II section 4.

In so doing, we would indelibly place the brand of impeachment on the Chief Executive Officer. Whether he is convicted and removed or not, he still suffers eternally throughout all of time the fact that impeachment was imposed upon him, which I think is an appropriate remedy. Even if we don't get a conviction I think we should let the world know that the House took up its responsibility. The House of Representatives did its job.

Of course, there is this notion now, another standard, that you have to have what I am calling a rock-solid case. I hear commentary that would lead me to believe that this has to be done only when you have evidence beyond all doubt; not a reasonable doubt, which is what we might have in court; not by clear and convincing evidence; clearly, not by the preponderance of the evidence, which is a very low standard, but beyond all doubt.

I am hearing persons speak such that one could conclude that if you didn't see it yourself, whatever the impeachable act is, that we need more evidence.

We have the Mueller report. We were told, let's wait for the Mueller report. We waited for the Mueller report. And then, well, we need to hear from Mr. Mueller. Mr. Mueller has spoken and has pretty much said: What you see is what you will get. He may ratify what is there, but it doesn't appear, based upon what I heard him say, that he will be giving nuanced testimony above and beyond what is contained in the report.

For those who want to hear from Mr. Mueller, I wouldn't get in the way of that. Let's have Mr. Mueller come and testify. But the truth is, the report, in and of itself, is evidence, because all of the statements contained in the Mueller report were taken from persons who were giving their testimony at the expense of committing perjury if they didn't give truthful statements.

So perjury was a consequence of giving an untruthful statement to the FBI

agents who were asking these questions. And the Mueller report is pretty good evidence. We could use that to impeach if we chose to do so.

I believe that the Mueller report contains some 10 opportunities for this Congress to engage in impeachment, bringing impeachment to the floor of this House for a vote. And for edification purposes, the President doesn't have to commit a crime to be impeached. We won that battle. That was one of the first things that was said when impeachment was called to the attention of this body some more than 2 years ago. What crime has he committed?

Well, we know now that you don't have to commit a crime. We knew then that you don't have to commit a crime. But it seems that there was an effort, almost, among some to distort what the law is for purposes that I cannot announce. But there seems to have been a desire to convince the public that the President must commit a crime to be impeached. That is not true.

What is the evidence of it not being true? The fact that Andrew Johnson was impeached in article 10 of the Articles of Impeachment against him in 1868 for speaking ill of Congress, which wasn't a crime then, and isn't a crime now.

Speaking ill of Congress is not a crime. He was impeached for speaking ill of Congress in article 10 of the Articles of Impeachment against Andrew Johnson. That is the best evidence, what has happened.

□ 2000

What has happened?

What we know to be the case. So those who would like to change the standard, you have got history to deal with, Madam Speaker. If you want to change the standard. To change the standard, you would have to literally erase what happened with Andrew Johnson.

There is no requirement that the President commit a crime to be impeached. He has to do harm to society. He has to breach the public trust—breach the public trust, cause harm to society—and you can be impeached if you are the Chief Executive Officer. There is no requirement that you commit a crime, no requirement that the Senate has to agree with the House before the House can act, and no requirement that there must be a national unity government before you can have impeachment.

These are standards that are being set that are, quite frankly, beyond the rationale that the Framers of the Constitution provided for us.

Read the Federalist Papers, Madam Speaker, and you will get a better understanding. Federalist 65 would be a good read. It is a short read, and you will get a better understanding.

So these standards—these unreasonable standards, in my opinion—are such that we will probably end up engaging in expediency and saying that we want to impeach for the purpose of expediency, but not making impeachment an action item. It is one thing to have political expediency, but another thing to turn that into an action item. The action item would have to be impeachment. You cannot just talk about this with certainty and not act, Madam Speaker.

The final thing that must be done pursuant to the moral imperative to act is to impeach. And I find that we are talking about this to the extent that we will do it eventually—if we are not very careful of what Dr. King called, engage in the paralysis of analysis—just analyze this and set standards. All standards keep changing from time to time.

But remember this, no one can set the standard for any one of us in the House of Representatives. All 435 of us have been given the standard of being a Member of the House and making a decision. I say this based upon what your conscience dictates and based upon a belief that Article II section 4 of the Constitution has been violated.

Speaking of Article II section 4 and the President not having to commit a crime, it is important to note this: high crimes and misdemeanors.

By the way, Madam Speaker, you can be impeached for a high misdemeanor. It doesn't have to be a high crime and misdemeanor. This is what a good many persons are still saying. Not true.

How do you know that you can be impeached for a high misdemeanor?

Because Andrew Johnson was impeached for a high misdemeanor. It doesn't have to be a high crime and misdemeanor. It can simply be a misdemeanor. A misdemeanor, Madam Speaker, can be a minor criminal offense or it can be a misdeed. The word ''misdemeanor'' was defined at the time the Framers wrote the Constitution, and to this day, as a misdeed. Andrew Johnson was impeached for a high misdeed in article 10 of the Articles of Impeachment against him.

Make notes. Write that down. Read it. Check. You will find the truth is there for a misdeed, a high misdeed, a high misdemeanor, and a misdemeanor is a misdeed.

Let's debunk the notion that impeachment will benefit the President. It has been debunked. The notion that you have to have a rock-solid case, there is no such thing as a rock-solid case or maybe some other term similar. There is no requirement.

The notion that impeachment is not political, well, that is not what the Framers of the Constitution said. That is not what is said in Federalist 65. Read Federalist 65. There is no requirement that you avoid politics. The Framers used that very word, ''political'', in Federalist 65. So the notion that impeachment can't be political is contrary to what the people who wrote the Constitution thought should be contained therein.

What is interesting to me is that we have a good many people here who believe in the intent of the law.

What was the intent?

I am starting to think that it is for convenience some of the time. Either you are for intent or you are not, Madam Speaker. Well, the intent of the Framers was that this would be political, and it is going to be political. You are not going to escape the politics of it with clever phrases. It is not going to happen. This is political the notion that you have to have a rock-solid case. That is beyond what is expected from the Framers. And I am not sure you are going to ever finish your investigation if you are going to continue to investigate until you have exhausted every possible thing before you move forward, and nobody can set that standard for the 435 Members of this House.

Next, we have the question of bigotry in policy. There are some who believe that it is okay to have bigotry intentionally placed in policy. Bigotry in policy, to decide that you are going to do something that will be bigoted as the Chief Executive Officer and you will put that into policy, to decide you are going to ban certain people from the country, to decide that you are going to change the rules because people may be from what might be called a s-hole country, change the rules for those from that s-hole country. And then to give some indication that you have bigotry within you by announcing that people who would say phrases like, ''blood and soil'', ''Jews will not replace us'', protesting out in the street, calling themselves members of groups that have been known infamously for behaving in invidious discrimination, give us all of the evidence that we need. I guarantee you that bigotry in policy is impeachable.

I assure you of this: I believe in the deepest corners of my soul that if a previous President said and did the things that the Chief Executive Officer has said and done, he would be impeached. He would be removed from office. And I would be one of the persons to support it. We cannot have double standards.

Madam Speaker, you can't have a standard that exists because you have a beneficial bigot, a bigot that serves a useful purpose, a bigot that benefits your agenda. All of your adult life you have been preaching against certain things, and then you get a beneficial bigot, someone that might do something such as, appoint persons to the court that you would like to have, and then your standards change. You accept bigotry in policy against people that I would call the least, the last, and the lost.

You would accept it against these babies, Madam Speaker. You would accept, accept, accept having a 4-month-old baby separated from his parents. At 4 months old, taken out of the arms of his father. And some time thereafter, when the father is trying to gain custody of his child, say to the father that

we will have to deport you, when you take your seat on the plane, we will bring your child to you. We will give you the child back.

This is the United States of America I am talking about. I love my country. I don't love that kind of behavior. I have great disdain for that level of behavior. Tell this man he is going to get his child, and then have him deported without his baby. This was reported some 2, 3 days ago in a reputable news source—separated. We know babies are being separated or have been separated. This is supposed to be the youngest, 4 months old. Later on you take the 4-month-old to court, you have a hearing. The baby is now with some people who are taking care of the baby. And then you finally decide the baby is now 6 months of age or there about and you will return this baby to his parents.

They have suffered greatly.

Can you imagine, someone taking your 4-month-old baby?

Can you imagine the pain, the sleepless nights, and the crying?

Can you imagine how your life would just be torn apart?

Your baby has been removed. Well, you finally get your baby back. One would assume that this would be a joyous occasion, but the baby doesn't recognize the parents.

Imagine the pain of reaching out to your baby, Madam Speaker, and your baby withdraws and turns to someone else, because a government had a policy of deterring people from coming by separating babies as young as 4 months old from parents.

I just don't abide with this. I cannot accept this. Those who can are a better person than I am. They are. It really does not matter what happens to me. The story of the Good Samaritan is not the story of the person who said: If I cross over and help this person, what is going to happen to me?

The story of the Good Samaritan is the story of the person who said: If I don't help this person, what is going to happen to him?

We use that parable quite a bit in this country.

The story of the person who is the brother's keeper is the story of a person who said: Am I my brother's keeper?

Well, we know this: you can't be your brother's keeper without keeping your brother. Brothers and sisters are our relatives. Distant though they may be, they are a part of humanity. They are ours. We belong to them, and they belong to us.

This kind of behavior is unacceptable. I have said before, and I will say again and again, if these babies were coming across the northern border we would have a different mindset. We would not have the mindset that we have now such that we put them in cages.

I went to the border. I wanted to see for myself, and I saw babies lying on a cement floor with some sort of tinfoil blanket over them in conditions that the SPCA would not allow animals to exist in.

If it doesn't touch your heart, Madam Speaker, you are a better person than I am, because it touched my heart. When I saw it, it hurt. This is about humanity. This is about persons fleeing harm's way. This is about a law that allows them to approach one of our agents, make a proper announcement, and get a fair hearing.

It is not about circumventing the law, trying to find clever ways to keep people out who are following the law. It is not about that. It is about people. It is about humanity. It is about the greatest country in the world and what people around the world think of us now.

I assure you, Madam Speaker, the image that we had is being tarnished, I won't say irreparably, but I will say it is being tarnished.

The lady with the golden lamp, or light, if you will, torch, give me your poor, you know the rest of the story, your tired, you know the rest of it. We have honored that. We took about 11 million people, I believe, from Europe. We didn't separate babies from mothers. We welcomed them.

Something has changed. Something has changed. We are witnessing before our very eyes a change in the culture and a change in our country, because we are witnessing before our very eyes that we seem to think that it is okay or that it is not something that we ought to address.

The President doesn't have to commit a crime, the Chief Executive Officer doesn't have to commit a crime to be impeached. We but have to have the will to do what we must, in my opinion.

By the way, my opinion is that we are more likely to impeach than not. This is my opinion. I really do believe that in this House there will be people who are going to conclude that they will not tolerate the level of injustice being perpetrated.

□ 2015

I believe it. I believe that there will be a majority to do it, more likely than not. I believe that it can and will happen. I really do.

I think that we should be deliberative, but I don't think that we should allow the paralysis of analysis to prevent us from doing our job.

I believe there will be enough people who are going to come forward to say we will hold the Chief Executive accountable for this behavior and other behavior: the whole notion that the Chief Executive can tell members of the constabulary, the police, that when they arrest people and they have them within their care, custody, and control, that they don't have to be nice to them; and the whole notion that the Chief Executive can ban people, that he can send out a tweet and kick people out of the military who have been serving honorably or prevent people from coming in because of who they are.

I believe that there are enough people who will find this offensive and that they will take the action that the Framers of the Constitution fully intended we take.

I close with this, a belief that we have been given an awesome responsibility. We were elected to the people's House. We were elected to do the work of the people, but we were also elected to do the morally righteous thing.

There are some times when we have to step beyond where the people may be at a given time because we know what is right and we are going to do the righteous thing. Sometimes, we have to do this. We just have to step out.

We don't take a poll, by the way. This whole notion that, until the country is with us, we can't do that which the law requires us to do, in my opinion, that whole notion that we can't do it until the country is with us, well, that is taking a poll.

A poll is a snapshot in time. That is all it is, just a snapshot in time. Are we going to allow something as necessary as impeachment to be governed by a poll?

I thank God that Dr. King and those who crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge did not do so based upon a poll, that they had huddled and said, ''Well, Dr. King, what do the polls say?''

If it is a righteous cause, the polls don't matter. We have to do that which is right, be led by the spirit sometimes, as a friend said to me, to do the right thing.

Polls. What if Rosa Parks had taken a poll? ''Let's take a poll before you take that seat on the bus, risking everything.'' She had no idea what her fate would be.

''Take a poll, Rosa.'' Would she have taken the seat if she had relied on polls?

What if Lincoln had said, ''Let's take a poll before we attempt to pass the 13th Amendment.''

Polls can prevent us from doing that which is bold. Bold actions are not predicated upon a poll. They are predicated upon the righteousness of the cause. If the cause is righteous, we ought to do the right thing.

Dr. King said the time is always right to do what is right.

I believe that we need not take polls, that we have enough evidence, that we shouldn't have unreasonable standards, and that this House can and will do its job.

I say ''more likely than not'' simply because anything is possible, I suppose. But I just believe that there are enough people here of goodwill who are going to decide that what we have seen is enough before we end up seeing something that we cannot reverse, something that could be beyond what we would want to see happen, not only to this country but to all countries, by way of what happens to one directly happens to all indirectly, according to Dr. King, because life is an inescapable network of mutuality.

I don't want to see something happen, but I do want to say this: Given that we know we can impeach right now, if we fail to impeach and some dastardly thing occurs, there will be Members of this House who will regret not having taken the appropriate action.

It is bigger than any one of us. This is about humanity. We ought to respect the means by which we can preserve integrity, the means by which we can preserve the lives that we have been charged with the responsibility of caring for as Members of this body.

Let us move forward.

I greatly appreciate the leadership for giving me this opportunity to be heard.

My dear friends, unless leadership changes the rules, I will be heard again because I plan to come back again and again. I assure my colleagues that if no one else does, there will be another vote on impeachment on the floor of the House of Representatives, not because I want to do it but because I believe I am forced to do it. I have little choice if I want to protect the integrity of the Constitution and preserve the notion of no person being above the law.

I believe I have a responsibility to do it. I don't like using the personal pronoun ''I'' as it relates to this, but I have no choice. It will be done. We will all go on RECORD.

I assure my colleagues, I will not approach any individual person to try to convince a person that he or she should do a given thing. I will talk from this podium, as I have, and I will answer those who may ask me questions. But I do believe we have to take this duty seriously, and we have to have a vote in the House of Representatives.

I am thankful for the time, Madam Speaker, and I greatly appreciate the opportunity to be a Member of this august body. While I am here, I plan to do all that I can to make sure, for the people I have been elected to serve, that I do what is in their best interests, even if they may not think it is in their best interests.

There are some things that are bigger than individuals. It is about a country. It is about humanity.

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

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

HONORING HIS EMINENCE ARCHBISHOP ELPIDOPHOROS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of His Eminence Archbishop Elpidophoros, who was recently elected the new Greek Orthodox Archbishop of America.

Archbishop Elpidophoros was born in Constantinople, Istanbul, Turkey, in 1967. Since August 2011, he has served as the abbot of the Patriarchal Monastery of Holy Trinity in Halki, where I had an opportunity to meet him this past April. What a wonderful, wonderful person.

Madam Speaker, our beloved seminary is located there as well.

He is an expert theologian. I was so blessed to have a conversation with him. He is kind and honorable. We could hope for no better qualities in our new archbishop.

He replaces Archbishop Demetrios, who has retired after 20 years at his post.

Archbishop Elpidophoros leads a church of more than 1½ million Greek Orthodox Christians in the United States, promoting the values of orthodoxy at every opportunity.

I wish Archbishop Elpidophoros the best in all of his endeavors and congratulate him on this great achievement. May God's grace be upon him in his new role.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of family medical emergency.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 19, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 299. To amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 21, 2019, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1348. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's Major final rule — Payday, Vehicle Title, and Certain High-Cost Installment Loans; Delay of Compliance Date; Correcting Amendments [Docket No.: CFPB-2019-0007] (RIN: 3170-AA95) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1349. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Rural Development, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Single Family Housing Direct and Guaranteed Loan Programs (RIN: 0575-AD13) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1350. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Health Reimbursement Arrangements and Other Account-Based Group Health Plans (RIN: 1210-AB87) received June 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1351. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental consolidated report to keep the Congress informed about deployments of United States Armed Forces equipped for combat, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1543(c); Public Law 93-148, Sec. 4(c); (87 Stat. 555) (H. Doc. No. 116—43); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1352. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Major final rule — Federal Employees Dental and Vision Insurance Program: Extension of Eligibility to Certain TRICARE-Eligible Individuals; Effective Date of Enrollment (RIN: 3206-AN58) received June 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1353. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0696; Product Identifier 2017-SW-101-AD; Amendment 39-19650; AD 2019-11-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1354. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0801; Product Identifier 2017-NM-147-AD; Amendment 39-19632; AD 2019-08-11] (RIN: 2120-AA640) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1355. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-1058; Product Identifier 2018-CE-051-AD; Amendment 39-19646; AD 2019-10-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1356. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BRP-Rotax GmbH & Co KG Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0916; Product Identifier 2018-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-19643; AD 2019-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1357. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0708; Product Identifier

2018-NM-072-AD; Amendment 39-19652; AD 2019-11-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1358. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0409; Product Identifier 2019-NM-092-AD; Amendment 39-19649; AD 2019-11-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1359. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0794; Product Identifier 2017-NM-175-AD; Amendment 39-19625; AD 2019-08-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1360. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0722; Product Identifier 2017-SW-104-AD; Amendment 39-19651; AD 2019-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1361. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Tulsa, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0110; Airspace Docket No.: 19-ASW-3] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. WATERS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1815. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission, when developing rules and regulations about disclosures to retail investors, to conduct investor testing, including a survey and interviews of retail investors, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116–123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. TITUS (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 3373. A bill to establish the Office of International Disability Rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUDA (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. COX of California):

H.R. 3374. A bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require the collection of small business loan data related to LGBTQ-owned businesses; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 3375. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the prohibitions on making robocalls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 3376. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for a minimum number of refugees who may be admitted in any fiscal year after fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 3377. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security the Biometric Identification Transnational Migration Alert Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 3378. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois):

H.R. 3379. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to shorten the exclusivity period for brand name biological products from 12 to 5 years; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 3380. A bill to require the recording and reporting of communications between the Department of Justice and the White House relating to civil and criminal investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DINGELL, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MENG, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. RYAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. TITUS, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 3381. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase transparency and reporting on campus sexual violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 3382. A bill to amend the public participation requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3383. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to minimum levels of financial responsibility for the transportation of property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CRIST, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 3384. A bill to authorize Federal agencies to establish prize competitions for innovation or adaptation management development relating to coral reef ecosystems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3385. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on the Advancement of Social Enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 3386. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require hospitals and critical access hospitals to provide uninsured individuals with access to the lowest negotiated rate for items and services furnished to such individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.R. 3387. A bill to create a pilot program for the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program at Lucy Garrett Beckham High School, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 3388. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish the Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing Transportation (SMART) Challenge Grant Program to promote technological innovation in our Nation's communities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3389. A bill to require the establishment of a Consumer Price Index for Elderly Consumers to compute cost-of-living increases for Social Security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act and to provide, in the case of elderly beneficiaries under such title, for an annual cost-of-living increase which is not less than 3 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 3390. A bill to incentivize manufacturers to relocate production to Opportunity Zones in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. OMAR, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. POCAN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 3391. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for in-State tuition rates for refugees and asylees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 3392. A bill to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BABIN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 3393. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit Federal funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting after fiscal year 2021; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 3394. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to strengthen the provisions relating to child labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3395. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the treatment of information sought or obtained for political advantage from foreign nationals, to require political committees under such Act to acknowledge in writing that they are aware of the provisions of such Act which prohibit the solicitation, acceptance, or receipt of money and other things of value from foreign nationals in elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 3396. A bill to expand the research activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to functional gastrointestinal and motility disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 3397. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance and to allow individuals to carry forward dependent care flexible spending arrangement account balances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 68. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H. Res. 452. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the recent free and fair parliamentary elections and transfer of power in Armenia, reaffirming the critical importance of the United States-Armenia partnership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS, Mr. CASE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. OMAR, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SOTO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. COX of California, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CROW, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. MENG, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H. Res. 453. A resolution recognizing the month of June as ''Immigrant Heritage Month'', a celebration of the accomplishments and contributions immigrants and their children have made in shaping the history, strengthening the economy, and enriching the culture of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GALLEGO, and Ms. SHERRILL):

H. Res. 454. A resolution calling upon the United States Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. MAST):

H. Res. 455. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the month of June 2019 as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Injury Awareness Month'' and June 27, 2019, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Injury Awareness Day''; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

75. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Resolution No. 816, urging the United States Congress to enact legislation to consolidate disaster recovery housing funding into a single Disaster Housing Response and Recovery Block Grant that would increase efficiency, save taxpayer dollars, and speed the recovery process by combining FEMA's short-term programs and HUD's long-term programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

76. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, urging the houses of the United States Congress to stand in unity and block the President's national emergency declaration by overriding the veto of House Joint Resolution 46 and, if not possible, to consider terminating the declaration of national emergency within 6 months or at the earliest possible time pursuant to the National Emergencies Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ROUDA:

H.R. 3374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution. That provision gives Congress the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 3376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United

States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 3377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 3378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 3379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 3380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I clause 8

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 3381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 3382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3383.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 3384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 3386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 3387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14: ''To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers . . .''

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 3388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 3390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 3391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 3392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 3393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 3394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 3397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 68.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two thirds of both Houses deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 35: Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 40: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 95: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 117: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 125: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 333: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 336: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 366: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 444: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 445: Mrs. LEE of Nevada and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 446: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 550: Ms. BASS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 555: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 573: Mr. FLORES and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 643: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 644: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 647: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 649: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 724: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 747: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 759: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 763: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 884: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 886: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. CASE, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 929: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 945: Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 961: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 969: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 971: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1018: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1043: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1049: Mr. MCEACHIN and Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 1094: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 1108: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1109: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 1133: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1139: Mr. LEWIS and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1153: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1154: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 1186: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1209: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1225: Mrs. AXNE and Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 1229: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1274: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TRONE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1309: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1317: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1396: Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1398: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. TURNER, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BOST, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1400: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 1417: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 1425: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1446: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1456: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1534: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 1552: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1570: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1614: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 1629: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. KILMER, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1632: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 1641: Mr. MORELLE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 1682: Mr. GOLDEN and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1692: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. WILD.

H.R. 1695: Mr. KATKO and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1709: Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. BASS, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1728: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1742: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1743: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1744: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1748: Mr. ROUDA and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1762: Mr. KINZINGER.
H.R. 1766: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1837: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. DELBENE, and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1840: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1850: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1869: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CLINE, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. COLE, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. WILD, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1881: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1882: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 1897: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 1900: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 1903: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BERA, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1941: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 1965: Mr. WALTZ.
H.R. 1968: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KIM, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
H.R. 1970: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1975: Mr. CORREA, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1998: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 2013: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 2015: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 2091: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 2096: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 2119: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2123: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2146: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2149: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 2156: Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 2158: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. SPANO.
H.R. 2178: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 2205: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 2229: Mr. SHERMAN and Ms. WILD.
H.R. 2232: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2256: Mr. WELCH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2271: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2311: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2339: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2354: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BERA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2381: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2382: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2408: Mr. CROW, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2420: Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. TRONE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
H.R. 2426: Ms. DEAN and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 2452: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2482: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2483: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 2494: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2507: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CASE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. COLE, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 2521: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2576: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2616: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2623: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 2702: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2721: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 2739: Mr. KATKO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. COMER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 2764: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2798: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 2829: Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2842: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 2854: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2865: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2869: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2912: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 2913: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2924: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 2933: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2969: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SPANO, Ms. SHALALA, Mrs. MURPHY, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2972: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 2975: Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.R. 2982: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 3000: Mr. GOODEN.
H.R. 3033: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3036: Mrs. LEE of Nevada and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 3056: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. GOODEN.
H.R. 3076: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 3078: Mr. BOST.
H.R. 3082: Mr. PAPPAS and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 3085: Mr. KEATING, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 3114: Mr. EVANS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OMAR, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 3135: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 3157: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 3178: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 3183: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 3189: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3190: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MAST, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Ms. MENG, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3192: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 3193: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 3195: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. KIM, Mr. BRINDISI, Ms. OMAR, Mr. KIND, Ms. DEAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. MENG, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. TRONE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. STANTON, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3197: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 3201: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3206: Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 3209: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3230: Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 3241: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 3262: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 3265: Mr. SUOZZI and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3307: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 3315: Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 3350: Mr. BOST, Mrs. LURIA, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 3371: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.J. Res. 32: Mr. PETERSON.
H.J. Res. 55: Mr. VAN DREW.
H. Res. 23: Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H. Res. 33: Mr. BACON and Mr. BEYER.
H. Res. 49: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H. Res. 134: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 189: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. HASTINGS.
H. Res. 230: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H. Res. 246: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Res. 255: Mr. KATKO and Mr. STAUBER.
H. Res. 257: Mr. CLAY.
H. Res. 259: Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. BOST, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H. Res. 324: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H. Res. 358: Mr. BEYER.
H. Res. 367: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 374: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. BOST, and Mr. WRIGHT.
H. Res. 379: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 408: Mr. MARCHANT.
H. Res. 432: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. TITUS.
H. Res. 441: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BERA, Ms. FRANKEL, and Mr. TRONE.
H. Res. 443: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H. Res. 444: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KIND, Mr. STANTON, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2407: Ms. DELAURO.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 2019 No. 104

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Ruler of all, we honor You and bear witness to Your mighty power. Do for our lawmakers more than they can ask or imagine. Let Your holy word be a lamp to their feet and a light for their path. Give them a wisdom that clears a path through complexity.

Lord, sanctify their thoughts, words, and actions until their dominant desire is to please You.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NOS. 27 THROUGH 48 EN BLOC—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume the en bloc consideration of following joint resolutions of disapproval, which the clerk will report by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 27) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom and Australia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 30) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res 34) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 41) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Government of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of technical data and defense services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 42) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 43) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 44) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed retransfer of certain defense articles from the United Arab Emirates to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res 45) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 46) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services; and

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask to speak as in morning business for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

''THIS IS IOWA'' CAMPAIGN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Gov. Kim Reynolds of my State of Iowa has unveiled what she calls the ''This is Iowa'' campaign. That campaign has encouraged people to choose Iowa to live and work.

Iowa has the second lowest unemployment rate in the Nation. As I travel Iowa with my county meetings, I hear from employers across Iowa that have high-paying skilled jobs they cannot fill. That is why Iowa was ranked the No. 1 State to find a job in 2019.

The cost of living is low and the quality of life is second to none. Check out thisisiowa.com to learn more. In the words of Meredith Wilson, of ''76 Trombones'' fame, from Mason City, IA: ''You really ought to give Iowa a try.''

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, by a wide bipartisan margin, the Senate began considering this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

The Senate has passed an NDAA each of the last 58 years. We authorize the resources, the equipment, the support systems, and the pay that keep our All-Volunteer Force the strongest in the world.

From the outside, this process may look routine, but as our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee know best, keeping America safe takes constant hard work and innovation.

We have all seen the recent headlines: ''Russia 'successfully tests' hypersonic intercept missile that can shoot down Western weapons,'' ''China's Military Technology Now Close to Parity With U.S.''

In just the last few hours, Iran shot down an American surveillance aircraft in international airspace over the Strait of Hormuz. Fortunately, the aircraft was unmanned.

Let me say that again. Last night, the Iranians shot down a U.S. aircraft in international airspace.

It could certainly not be clearer that we need to keep modernizing our national defense, continue rebuilding our readiness, and persist with our new national defense strategy.

Fortunately, this legislation includes billions of dollars for modernizing our capabilities, restoring the Navy's fleet strength, and investing in the latest generation of combat aircraft. There are billions more for critical research weapons aimed at keeping U.S. weapons systems on the cutting edge and ensuring American servicemembers never enter a fair fight. It prioritizes greater efficiency and transparency at the Pentagon so we can better support military families through the sacrifices of service.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member JACK REED for guiding the committee process. I hope the Senate can work through this legislation swiftly and give it the overwhelming bipartisan vote it deserves.

ARMS SALES

Mr. President, on a related matter, in addition to completing the NDAA, the Senate will today have to dispense with several more privileged resolutions concerning arms sales to close American partners in a troubled but important region.

These close partners deserve our support. I am glad we secured a bipartisan understanding yesterday to expedite their consideration so the 22 separate resolutions which Members have introduced will not jeopardize the Defense bill or the emergency border funding we must also consider next week.

Today this body, yet again, will debate and cast votes concerning our relationship with Saudi Arabia, just like we did in March and December and the previous March.

I think the vast majority of Senators share serious concerns over some of the policies and actions of our Saudi partners, but rejecting long-planned arms sales strikes me as an overly blunt tool with several unintended consequences.

For example, the arms sales affected by this vote are not just for Saudi Arabia but also for the United Arab Emirates, and they include sales that affect Israel, India, Korea, and Jordan.

Last December, the Senate passed a nuanced resolution that delivered exactly the message we wanted to deliver: our fury over the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, our concerns about the war in Yemen, and our desire for more accountability. That was the right approach.

There is no shortage of tools available to the United States that are more appropriate to communicate frustrations and urge better behavior, whether from the administration or our partners.

Senators could meet with Saudi officials to directly express their concerns. They could travel to the region to see firsthand complicated, fluid situations.

Rapid societal and economic change is providing Saudi citizens with unprecedented political openness but also troubling human rights concerns and erratic policy decisions. The dynamics at play are not black and white.

We can best shape these dynamics by working closely with our partners to encourage them in the right direction, rather than turning our back.

Concerned Members might also begin giving fairer treatment and more prompt consideration to the well-qualified experts who are waiting to contribute to our diplomacy. Recall that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Near Eastern Affairs just started his job last Monday after he had been held up for more than a year. The top State Department job in the Middle East was held open for more than a year.

The nominees for Ambassador to the UAE, Egypt, and Libya are having hearings today. I hope their confirmations will move more quickly than those of other senior diplomats who languished for months.

So there is no shortage of productive steps at Members' disposal, but recklessly canceling U.S. arms sales to key regional partners is not on the list.

So the question the Senate will soon consider is really this: whether we will lash out at an imperfect partner and undercut our own efforts to build cooperation, check Iran, and achieve other important goals or whether we will keep our imperfect partners close and use our influence; whether we will push Riyadh and Abu Dhabi away from the United States and push them closer to Moscow and Beijing or whether we will stay engaged and help our partners course-correct where we can; whether to signal at this hour of tension that we cannot be relied upon to stand with our friends, sending a message that will embolden Tehran, or whether to find more private, effective ways of encouraging better behavior while sending a message of solidarity in troubled times.

The situation in the Middle East, as we speak, could hardly be more fraught. The timing could not be worse for the Senate to send the wrong signal.

In just the last several hours, we have seen reports that a missile from inside Yemen has struck a utility plant in Saudi Arabia. This is after other attacks—almost certainly from the Iran-backed Houthi forces—on Saudi Arabia and the UAE, including attacks on civilian vessels and on a civilian airport.

Again, just last night, Iran shot down a U.S. intelligence aircraft that was flying in international airspace. So the Senate could hardly pick a worse time for clumsy and ill-considered resolutions that would hurt key relationships in the Middle East.

Let's not cut ourselves off from our partners. Let's not undercut the administration at a time of such delicate diplomacy and tension with Iran. So I ask my colleagues to vote down these resolutions.

NOMINATION OF KELLY KNIGHT CRAFT

Mr. President, on another matter, I had the opportunity to introduce a skillful leader and fellow Kentuckian before the Foreign Relations Committee only just yesterday. Kelly Knight Craft was confirmed by voice vote in 2017 to serve as the U.S. Ambassador to Canada. Now she is the President's choice to serve as Ambassador to the United Nations.

Ambassador Craft's success in representing American interests in Canada certainly rewarded the Senate's vote of confidence. During a dynamic and sometimes challenging period in the U.S.-Canada friendship, she has navigated it with care. She has helped to shepherd the USMCA. She has helped to secure cooperation on sanctioning Russia for its aggression against Ukraine and on pursuing democracy for Venezuela. She has spoken out forcefully, when necessary, against China.

Not surprisingly, this talented diplomat has earned great respect both at home and abroad.

The Premier of Ontario has said:

Every premier I know thinks the world of her. . . . She really proved herself over some tough times.

The former Deputy to Ambassador Nikki Haley has described Ambassador Craft as a worthy successor—''smart, capable, and knowledgeable about the foreign policy challenges facing our country.''

This body confirmed Ambassador Craft to her current post by voice vote. Since then, she has only gained even more experience, further refined her expertise, and demonstrated her talent even more clearly. Her testimony yesterday reinforced these things even further.

President Trump has made an excellent selection to serve our Nation in this critical role at the U.N. She deserves bipartisan support from the Foreign Relations Committee and, when the time comes, a swift confirmation here on the Senate floor.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, on a final matter, for nearly 2 months, my Republican colleagues and I have come to the floor constantly to raise the alarm on the humanitarian crisis down at the border. Record numbers of migrants have pressed upon the U.S.-Mexico border, including never-before-seen numbers of families and unaccompanied children. The agencies that care for these individuals and the facilities that house them have been stretched dangerously thin.

We all know this. That is why the administration requested supplemental funds 7 weeks ago. It is why agency heads and law enforcement officials have literally begged Congress to act. Yet, until yesterday, we had not seen progress, which leads one to ask why. It is because—stop me if this sounds familiar—the Democratic House of Representatives has been more interested in denying this White House whatever it asks for, however necessary it might be, simply because it has been this White House that has been asking for it.

My friend the Democratic leader has acknowledged publicly it has been the Democratic-controlled House that has been the hurdle. One House Democrat from a border State has likewise admitted that it has been the left flank of his own conference that has been the stumbling block.

As the press has noted, some leading Democrats have let partisanship so cloud their judgment that they have actually called the humanitarian problem a manufactured crisis or an artificial crisis. Really?

Well, these 7 weeks of wasted time have made two things abundantly clear—that partisanship doesn't change the facts and that ''the resistance'' doesn't pay the bills. The House Democrats have failed to get their act together, so now the Senate is going to move forward.

Yesterday, thanks to the leadership of Chairman SHELBY and Senator LEAHY, the Appropriations Committee approved a significant funding measure by an overwhelming vote of 30 to 1—just the kind of big, bipartisan vote we ought to see in this particular situation for noncontroversial funding for necessary programs to mitigate a national crisis.

The Republicans have been urging this kind of consensus literally for weeks, and now the Senate is finally rising to the occasion. We need to vote on this legislation before we recess at the end of the month.

The Senate should not let even more time slip by without addressing this crisis head-on, and if we receive the same kind of bipartisan cooperation that was signaled in the committee vote yesterday, we will not have to.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IRAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, over the past few months, tensions with Iran have escalated. There have been a series of attacks on tankers in the Gulf region, and this morning it was reported that Iran has shot down a U.S. drone.

These events are deeply concerning—all the more so because the Trump administration has not explained to Congress or to the American people how it views these events, how it plans to respond, and, most importantly, what the broader strategy for confronting Iran is.

President Trump left the diplomatic agreement a little more than a year ago. It was obvious to anyone who even had a cursory knowledge of Iran that it would create consequences. With that decision, there is a course set for conflict—conflict whose purpose or strategy has never been articulated to the American people.

The President says on TV: It is a much better Iran than when I took office. Well, they were not building nuclear weapons—and I opposed the Iran agreement, as you know. But they were not building nuclear weapons. They were proceeding along the path of the agreement, and the President, as he seems to, just gets a bug in his head, something he said in the campaign without thinking, and then upends foreign policy—another example of chaos in this administration. But he has done that. He has done that.

So now the issue is what is our strategy to deal with the consequences? The American people have to know this. We have seen too many conflicts in the Middle East escalate into war—escalate into a 10-year war.

The American people are not for spending a fortune and, more importantly, lives of Americans overseas. They want us to focus here at home, but the kind of adventurism—almost unplanned, unthought out, and, certainly, unexplained adventurism—of the President is the wrong way to go and could lead to severe consequences. And, I must say, even in closed-door briefings with Senators, the administration doesn't have a strategy.

This is not how democracy is supposed to work. This is not how the CEO of a major Nation or even a major company should behave, with no articulated strategy. The President needs to explain to the American people why he is driving us toward another endless conflict in the Middle East.

SAUDI ARABIA

Madam President, on Saudi Arabia, another matter concerning the administration's foreign policy, today the Senate will vote on resolutions of disapproval for arms sales to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the UAE.

These 22 resolutions introduced by Senator MENENDEZ would block billions of dollars in military sales, including the transfer of tens of thousands of precision-guided munitions that the Saudis have previously used to bomb innocent civilians in Yemen.

The timing of these votes is significant. Last night the United Nations issued a report that documented evidence that the Saudis meticulously planned the murder of Jamal Khashoggi and ''forensically''—their words—disposed of the evidence.

According to the report, the Saudis referred to Mr. Khashoggi as a sacrificial animal and that dismembering the body would be easy—how gross, how cruel, how beyond words.

Are we going to blithely go along and let the Saudis continue? They are an ally. Everyone knows that. That doesn't mean you let allies do the most horrible things and just treat it as if nothing happened. But in the wake of such monstrosity, the Trump administration is proposing another round of billions of dollars in arms sales to Saudi Arabia.

Well, we should at least have a debate about whether that is the right course of action. Leader MCCONNELL was on the floor saying: What are the Democrats doing here? We are debating, Mr. Leader. You have one view; I

may have another. But the American people are entitled to a debate on this important issue, and that is what the law provides, and that is the tool we use—one of the few tools we have to actually cause debate in this Chamber, which the leader, with his legislative graveyard, has assiduously avoided. With his reducing the amount of time that we can talk about and vet nominees, he has assiduously avoided that, turning this Chamber into a graveyard that the American people despise. But here we have an opportunity to debate, and even here the leader seems to be decrying that fact, in my view.

The administration is claiming emergency power and trying to circumvent congressional review of these arms sales. That premise must be rejected. It sets a dangerous precedent for congressional oversight of future arms sales, and it can lead to renewed conflicts. We are also discussing that, parenthetically, in relation to Iran. Should Congress have some say there? You will hear more from me later on that.

The very least Congress can do is to debate the merits of sending Saudi Arabia billions of dollars in military technology it may use not to confront Iran but to perpetrate one of the largest humanitarian catastrophes of its generation.

Saudi Arabia, even though it be an ally, must be held accountable for its human rights abuses in Yemen and the grotesque murder of Jamal Khashoggi.

HARRIET TUBMAN

Madam President, now, on the Tubman issue, more than 3 years ago then-Treasury Secretary Jack Lew announced that he had ordered an accelerated redesign of the $20 bill with a new design to feature Harriet Tubman's portrait on the face of the bill. The design was set to be released in 2020, the 100th anniversary of women getting the right to vote—a fitting tribute to an extraordinary American and an extraordinary New Yorker.

There are no women or people of color on our paper currency today, even though they make up a significant majority of our population. There haven't been for more than a century. The plan to put Harriet Tubman on the $20 note was a long overdue way to recognize that disparity and rectify it.

But shortly after the Trump administration took office, all mention of the Tubman $20 bill was deleted from the Treasury Department's website without any explanation. Then, Secretary Mnuchin testified that a decision had been made to delay the release of the $20 note until 2028, and Treasury refused to confirm that Harriet Tubman's image would ever appear on it.

The official word from the White House was that the delay was required to accommodate anti-counterfeiting measures. But if you believe that, I have a bridge that I can sell you. It is simply not credible that with all the resources of the Treasury Department, a decade or more would be required to produce a $20 bill.

A century ago, New Yorkers built the Empire State building in a little over a year. We landed a man on the Moon in what seems to be less time. Surely the 21st century Treasury Department can redesign a bill in a reasonable period of time. The questions as to why the White House, the Treasury, and maybe even the President delayed this are looming and real, given the President's attitude toward women and minorities.

I have asked the Department of Treasury inspector general to launch an investigation into the circumstances surrounding the Treasury's decision. The official reasons given aren't credible. The whole thing smacks of politics. President Trump has referred to efforts to replace Andrew Jackson on the $20 bill as pure political correctness. To recognize more than half the people in our society, to recognize more than 25 percent of Americans who are people of color, all of whom have worked so hard to strive for this great country—is that political correctness? What is wrong with this President? What is wrong with this President, and what instincts is he appealing to? What bad instincts is he appealing to? It seems to be his practice, his way, his MO.

So among the questions the inspector general should examine is what role President Trump played in this apparent effort to renege on Treasury's 2016 commitment to honor Harriet Tubman.

Whatever the President's sentiments toward Jackson are, there is no reason to reverse the original Treasury Department decision to recognize Harriet Tubman's historic legacy on the $20 bill, which would still feature our seventh President on the reverse side.

I hope the inspector general will get to the bottom of this, but in the meantime, I hope President Trump himself is asked to answer for these delays. It would truly be a sordid state of affairs if the President or his team, for political reasons, interfered with and infected the process for designing American currency.

BACKGROUND CHECKS

Madam President, now, finally, on background checks, in the early hours on Monday, a heavily armed man approached the Federal building in downtown Dallas and started shooting. This was a civilian walking into the middle of an American city with military-grade weapons, a mask, and body armor, and he was prepared to inflict the maximum level of damage possible.

It is to the credit of the incredible first responders that this accident did not result in the loss of innocent life, but it is remarkable that events like this now seem all too routine, and so the news cycle barely covers them before moving on.

Barely a week goes by without an incident like this somewhere in America. We are the only Nation in the developed world where these kinds of things—these horrible things—happen with regularity. Virginia Beach, Highland Ranch, Poway, and Aurora, IL, are all examples of shootings that have taken place this year alone.

Later today, I will join several of my colleagues from the House and the Senate, including our former colleague, the great Gabby Giffords, to urge Leader MCCONNELL to bring background check legislation to the floor of the Senate. It has been 114 days since the House passed the measure, which more than 90 percent of Americans support, including more than 80 percent of Republicans and the majority of gun owners. But it seems that Leader MCCONNELL has set aside another plot in his legislative graveyard for this potentially lifesaving bill.

For too long, the gun lobby has reflexively opposed gun safety reforms, even the most obvious and noncontroversial reforms, like closing loopholes in background checks, and, for too long, the Republican majority has marched in lockstep with them.

The American people demand we do these rational acts. The House has passed it overwhelmingly with a bipartisan vote. Where are Republicans? Are they still cowering before the NRA? I remind them, the NRA is a lot weaker today than it was a few years ago. It is time to do the right thing and stop being scared.

Let's move this bill to the floor. Let Leader MCCONNELL finally let us debate an issue long overdue.

ELECTION SECURITY

Madam President, finally, as we continue to debate the NDAA, I urge Leader MCCONNELL once again to allow and support amendments to protect our elections from future attacks.

Election security is a national security issue of the highest urgency. There aren't two sides to this debate. No one can defend doing nothing as the Russians, and maybe the Chinese, the Iranians, and the North Koreans, mess with the wellspring of our democracy—our elections.

As we have seen time and again from reports by the FBI, intelligence agencies, and the Mueller report, our elections came under attack from Russia in the last Presidential election. FBI Director Wray has warned that they are coming for us again, and he thinks it could be worse than in 2016.

Leader MCCONNELL will not deny that this is true. So what are we waiting for? We know the threat is there. We know we can take steps to minimize it. So why won't Leader MCCONNELL let us act?

We have several options for legislative action, many of them bipartisan. People on both sides of the aisle—Democrats and Republicans—care about this issue and have worked on legislation together, something not done frequently enough around here, and Leader MCCONNELL just sits on these bills.

Last week, Senator WARNER asked unanimous consent to simply say the FBI should be informed when a foreign power tries to influence an election. I believe Senator BLUMENTHAL will try

to do the same thing today. Is Leader MCCONNELL going to instruct one of his Republicans to block it again? Will he have the courage to block it himself if he wants it blocked?

The logical solution is to let us debate the bills. If Leader MCCONNELL will not cooperate on this matter, Democrats are going to stand up for our democracy on our own, if we have to. We are going to ask unanimous consent to allow debate on these bills. We will insist on amendments to the NDAA. Leader MCCONNELL has suggested he wants an open amendment process, so let's press the matter, and we will continue to push for more election security funding as part of a deal on budget caps.

There are not two sides on this one; there are just not. There is only one right answer: action to safeguard our election. I urge Leader MCCONNELL to let us move on this issue. Stop stalling, stop obstructing. The legislative graveyard is full enough as it is. Let's come together, Democrats and Republicans, to protect our grand, imperiled democracy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, we have begun consideration of this year's National Defense Authorization Act, which is annual legislation to authorize funding for our military and national defense.

Like last year's bill, this year's National Defense Authorization Act emphasizes military modernization and readiness and the need to ensure that we are prepared to counter threats from great powers like China and Russia, as well as terrorists and rogue states.

I am offering a handful of amendments to this legislation, including an amendment to address training opportunities for our Nation's military pilots and aircrews.

In my home State of South Dakota, we are privileged to play host to Ellsworth Air Force Base, home of two B–1 bomb squadrons of the 28th Bomb Wing, the airmen who are the backbone of operations, as well as the 89th Attack Squadron and its control stations for MQ–9 Reapers. It is also home to the Powder River Training Complex, training airspace for Ellsworth aircrews and crews from across the United States. In the very near future, Ellsworth will be the home of the forthcoming B–21 bomber.

When I was first elected to the Senate, Ellsworth's future was not looking bright. In fact, in 2005, just a few months into my first term, Ellsworth was targeted for closure by the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Fortunately, thanks to the efforts of a lot of dedicated people, we managed to demonstrate to the Commission that Ellsworth was a vital national security asset and that closing the base and moving its fleet of B–1s would actually cost money.

Since then, strengthening Ellsworth has been a priority for me and for a lot of other people back home in South Dakota, and Ellsworth has been going from strength to strength.

One of my proudest achievements as a Senator was helping secure the expansion of the Powder River Training Complex, the training airspace over Ellsworth. The expansion quadrupled the size of the airspace. But prior to the expansion, the airspace was only large enough for one B–1 bomber to train at a time, which meant crews had to commute elsewhere to meet their training needs.

Today, the airspace is large enough to hold large-force training exercises, involving a variety of planes from other bases. In fact, the Powder River Training Complex is now the largest training airspace in the continental United States. In addition to the vast space it offers for training exercises, it also provides a valuable opportunity for pilots to train in conditions that resemble combat missions, such as low-altitude flying over mountainous terrain.

Since the Powder River Training Complex was expanded, Ellsworth has hosted a number of successful large-force exercises. This May, Ellsworth hosted its most recent Combat Raider large-force exercise, which featured B–1, B–2, and B–52 bombers, J-STAR and AWACS radar systems, F–16s, and KC–135 tankers. Notably, F–35s from Hill Air Force Base in Utah also participated, marking the first of what I think will be many training opportunities for the F–35 in the Powder River Training Complex.

These Combat Raider exercises highlight the potential of the PRTC for training our military aviators, and I want to make sure that we can meet these training needs as we look to bring the B–21 into the fleet. That is why I filed an amendment, Thune amendment No. 759, to require a strategic airspace review.

My amendment would require a report on how far our current national airspace system meets our national security requirements and how we might improve this system to meet current and future training needs.

The Air Force and the Federal Aviation Administration would be required to consult on this report to develop a full picture of the strategic value of our national airspace.

The report would also analyze whether the current airspace system gives the military sufficient access to the airspace it requires to meet its worldwide operational, training, and testing needs.

In particular, it seeks to determine whether current civil and military cooperation mechanisms are providing for the effective and efficient management of the national airspace system for military training. It also asks whether the current Department of Defense and FAA processes provide sufficient time to plan for large-force exercises.

For example, in the Powder River Training Complex, the Air Force needs to go through a lengthy process to secure altitude waivers from the FAA to fly higher on just a few days a year for just a few hours a day. We absolutely need to have appropriate procedures to ensure safety and coordination with commercial airlines, but the Air Force also needs enough lead time to schedule its aircraft and airmen traveling from other bases. We shouldn't be missing out on critical training opportunities because of a lengthy process that is ripe for expediting.

So my amendment would take a look at this process, including whether FAA air traffic control centers could temporarily or permanently realign their boundaries to streamline their role in military training.

For example, the Powder River Training Complex straddles the convergence of the Minneapolis, Denver, and Salt Lake City air traffic control centers, and coordinating with all three can be cumbersome. This report would explore whether we can make the process more efficient for both the FAA and the military.

It would also review whether the current airspace system is sufficient to prepare military aviators to meet high-end threats, including fifth-generation aircraft, unmanned aerial vehicles, and hypersonic weapons.

It is important that we ensure that our airmen can train in realistic conditions so they can deliver when America is counting on them the most. Just as in sports, you play like you practice—although we all know this isn't play, and the stakes for getting it right are very high.

That is why my amendment would investigate whether current civil and military cooperation mechanisms are sufficient for our military to replicate contested combat airspace, denied access airspace, and airspace without the use of GPS—the kinds of conditions aircrews would likely encounter if they got the call to fight tonight.

My amendment also takes a step back to look at the state of our national airspace system. It calls for an audit of special-use airspaces, military operations areas, commercial routes, and other routes, and it asks if parts of underutilized airspaces can be effectively returned to the national airspace to boost commercial route efficiencies in high-traffic areas in exchange for more generous military training flight permissions in low-traffic areas.

Comparatively, we don't get as much commercial airline traffic up in the Powder River Training Complex, creating a great opportunity for fifth-generation aircraft to really stretch their legs and meet their training needs.

I have talked a lot about our military's need to have the best training opportunities available. However, I want to clarify that this is not a one-sided amendment.

Our military goes to great lengths to respect commercial and general aviation needs, and that is reflected in my amendment. First and foremost, the FAA is consulted throughout the entire report process. Additionally, the bill reviews whether commercial and general aviation receive sufficient notice regarding exercises and special-use waivers, and, as I mentioned, it looks for ways to make Department of Defense and FAA interaction more efficient.

As a former chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee and a current member of the Commerce Subcommittee on Aviation and Space, I know that the management of the national airspace is complicated. My amendment simply seeks to gather information so that we can take a productive look at our national airspace and make sure our military aviators can get the most out of their training opportunities while respecting the needs of commercial and general aviation.

The Armed Services Committee chairman and ranking member, my colleagues, and staff members have a lot of amendments to consider. Hundreds of amendments have already been filed on the National Defense Authorization Act, and there are more to come. I would ask that my amendment No. 759 be considered for inclusion as we work together to restore and modernize our military and ensure our men and women in uniform have the tools they need to defend our country.

I thank my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ARMS SALES

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, there has been a lot of confusion and outright misinformation about some proposed arms sales to our gulf partners—specifically, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. I am grateful for the opportunity this morning to clear up a few things, especially considering the current high stakes in the region.

As many of you probably have heard, the Islamic Republic of Iran just this morning shot down an American surveillance aircraft over the Strait of Hormuz—yet another act of reckless, unprovoked aggression targeting lawful behavior on the high seas and in the skies. Still, I know that for some of my colleagues here, Iranian acts of violence are always to be excused or somehow always the fault of America and especially of the Trump administration, to which the only appropriate response is to continue to appease the ayatollahs, to send them pallets of cash, as the last administration did, and give them billions of dollars in relief for sanctions—essentially to say: Pretty please, stop your acts of terroristic aggression and imperial ambition throughout the region.

It is my duty to inform all those colleagues that this is dangerous and misguided thinking. Iran, as it did in the mid-1980s, will meet American restraint with continued aggression. It will watch the outcome of today's votes in support for our friends in the gulf for signs of resolve or weakness. I urge my fellow Senators to send the right message to Tehran.

The administration plans to sell roughly $8 billion in arms to our gulf partners so they can defend themselves, as well as the many thousands of Americans within their borders—all from Iranian aggression. Canceling those sales would not only endanger Americans overseas and deprive American industry of billions in exports, it would weaken some of the only countries in a position to effectively resist Iran's violent rampage throughout the Middle East.

We have heard many objections to these arms sales. First and most amazing, given the stakes, some Democrats object for procedural reasons. They are upset that the administration is proceeding over an informal hold placed by the senior Senator from New Jersey. In doing so, they claim that the administration is violating a long tradition of honoring informal holds by the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In effect, they are saying: Let's block arms sales to our allies in an emergency because the Secretary of State hurt the feelings of a few Senators.

The actual purpose of those holds—only a courtesy; not a rule; not a law—is to give those Senators time to fully examine a proposal and to foster engagement between the Senate and administration in good faith. But that is not how this hold is being used. These arms sales have been held for more than a year—more than a year. How much time does the Senator from New Jersey need to make up his mind? How many times does the Secretary of State have to call him and meet with him? How many briefings do they have to provide? How many memos do they have to send?

This is not a request for more information or trying to work together in good faith. This is a stalling tactic, through and through. It is yet another example of the Democrats engaged in psychological projection in accusing this administration of violating norms, when in fact they are the ones who have been violating longstanding, unwritten rules, customs, and norms.

The administration is moving forward with this sale by making an emergency declaration, as provided by law and as Presidents have done many times in the past. President Reagan proceeded with sales of air-defense systems to, yes, Saudi Arabia using this very same provision. President George H. W. Bush did so as well, selling tanks and fighter aircraft to, yes, Saudi Arabia.

Even without this precedent, can there be any doubt—any doubt that our partners in the gulf are facing a genuine emergency as they fend off Iran? Oil tankers flying the flags of our allies and partners are ablaze in the Gulf of Oman. Civilian airports, oil pipelines, and American surveillance aircraft have all come under rocket attacks from Iran's terror proxy in Yemen.

Make no mistake—this is a genuine emergency, but too few of my colleagues are willing to see the plain facts. They want to talk about anything that will change the subject from Iran and its campaign of aggression throughout the Middle East.

A second objection is that some argue that our gulf partners are somehow beneath our support. Really? It was the United Arab Emirates, after all, that hosted Pope Francis earlier this year, and he conducted a mass for Christians in that nation. The Kingdom of Jordan is another important friend caught in the crossfire of this debate. Jordan has been a reliable and trustworthy partner of the United States for many years, and today it bears the brunt of the refugee crisis and chaos created by Assad's Iran-backed butchery in Syria.

While Democrats try to frame this vote as support for our gulf partners alone, let's not forget that numerous other strong allies of the United States would be affected by these votes as well, countries like the United Kingdom and France and South Korea and Israel—all part of the supply chain affected by these deals. Rejecting these sales will hurt them, too, and now is not the time to be rejecting our friends. Of course, you couldn't make any of these observations about the Islamic Republic of Iran, which is about as likely to host the Pope as it is to host a Pride parade.

Lost in the criticism of our partners is a much more worthy discussion about the elaborate architecture of torture and repression supervised by Ayatollah Khameini, who is personally responsible for American citizens being held in appalling captivity for years at a time. One such American citizen, Bob Levinson, has been missing in Iran for more than a decade.

The same media and politicians who trumpet every misdeed of America's steadfast partners in the region—regardless of whether such misdeeds are fact or fiction—are strangely silent about the undisputed fact that Iran has the blood on its hands of more than 600 American troops in Iraq in the last decade. Six hundred Americans were killed at the hands of Iran. Yet we propose to deny arms sales to some of the only countries that are committed to resisting Iran's bloodstained, anti-American theocracy? It is time to get our priorities straight.

Third, still other critics fault our gulf partners for their involvement in the civil war in Yemen, as though they are the aggressors in Yemen rather than states that were pulled into a conflict to push an Iranian-armed rebel group off of the Arabian Peninsula at the request of the Government of Yemen and with the support of the United Nations. Evidently, some of my fellow Senators would counsel our gulf partners to do nothing as a rebel group, armed by their sworn enemy, plunged a neighboring country into chaos, shooting rockets at their airports and oil pipelines. That would indeed be quite a restrained foreign policy. Some might also call it the height of stupidity that we would never tolerate for our own citizens.

As to the appalling human rights conditions in Yemen, I think the current U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, Matthew Tueller, said it best to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: ''Almost 100 percent of the humanitarian catastrophe in Yemen has been caused by the Iranian-backed Houthis.'' Almost 100 percent. Mr. Tueller is not some Trump appointee. He is not some partisan hack. He is a career Foreign Service officer who served as Ambassador to Yemen under, yes, President Obama. If there is anyone in the U.S. Government who is in a position to know what is going on in Yemen and who is to blame for the carnage in Yemen, it is the man on the ground rather than politicians in Washington.

Underlying this whole debate is a romantic wish—a naive delusion—that our foreign policy can always be pristine, requiring no compromises whatsoever, no acknowledgment of the messy facts around the world, or even that we could flee away from that messy, complicated, dangerous world entirely, relying solely on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans to keep us safe. A cursory review of history proves that neither option is available. A cursory review of newspaper headlines proves it too.

Our main adversary in the Middle East—the Islamic Republic of Iran—is a revolutionary power dedicated, from its inception years ago, to the destruction of Americans and, indeed, America itself. They don't try to hide it. ''Death to America'' is their slogan, and they chant it all the time. Our departure from the field will not dissuade the ayatollahs from that purpose; it will only embolden them, as will the abandonment of our allies in the region.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, the arms industry is a unique industry. It is not like making shoes or apparel. It is not like selling watches. You are selling things that, when used properly, kill other people. They are deadly weapons that we have. We have accumulated the technology by the taxpayer paying for this. We have helicopters, planes, guided missiles, and we are able to refuel planes.

It is not a jobs program, and it is not something that—we don't willy-nilly give weapons to everyone. We don't sell weapons to Russia and we don't sell weapons to China because we have disagreements, and we don't think it would be in our best interest to sell weapons to them.

We also don't sell weapons, typically, to people we think are untrustworthy. I think there is every evidence that Saudi Arabia can be put in that category. When you have direct evidence and when our own intelligence community has concluded that there is high confidence that the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia butchered a dissident with a bone saw in a consulate in a foreign country, you would think that would give us pause as to giving Saudi Arabia or selling Saudi Arabia more weapons.

But it is worse than that. We are not only selling Saudi Arabia offensive weapons, we are also talking about giving them nuclear technology. The nuclear technology, they say, is only for energy, but you have to wonder. A country that sits atop one of the largest oil reserves in the world is now saying ''Oh, we don't have enough fossil fuel. We need nuclear power''? There have been people who have gotten nuclear technology and then have moved on to nuclear weapons.

What could possibly be the worst thing to happen to the Middle East? It would be to have three powers there with nuclear weapons. We had Iran before. They now have the knowledge to enrich. They made an agreement not to enrich. They are still threatening to enrich uranium. What do you think will happen if Saudi Arabia gets nuclear technology and there is any rumor of their progressing on towards developing nuclear weapons? What will Iran do? Automatically, they will do the same thing.

It also happens in the conventional weapons arena. So every time we sell or give missiles to Saudi Arabia, what do you think Iran does? They have to either buy more or make more. It is an arms race. We are feeding both sides of an arms race.

But you will hear people in Washington say: But Iran—they are a malign influence. Well, yeah. So is Saudi Arabia. But what do we do when we have two powers that show tendencies toward evil and show tendencies toward acting in ways that are against our national interest? Do we just blindly give weapons to anybody who is opposed to Iran because Iran is a malign influence? Well, what about Saudi Arabia? They have spent $100 billion spreading this radical jihadism to other cultures; $100 billion around the world preaching hatred of Christians, hatred of Jews, hatred of Hindus. Yet we give them more weapons.

There is a madrasa supported by Saudi Arabia—that is a so-called religious school in Pakistan—and 80 percent of the boys who graduate from the school—because, of course, girls aren't allowed to go to school under this kind of religion—80 percent of the boys who graduate from the school fight in the Taliban against the United States. Why would we give weapons to a country that teaches hatred of our country and actually trains fighters to fight against our soldiers? What person in what insane world thinks it is a good idea to fund people who fundamentally don't like us? Why in the world do we keep doing this?

Last week, we voted on sending weapons to Qatar. Do you know who Qatar supplies weapons with? Hamas. I thought we were allies with Israel. But we fund Qatar, which sends missiles and weapons to Hamas, who then bombs Israel. Qatar also hosts fundraisers for ISIS. Remember ISIS—the ones chopping people's heads off? Why would we give weapons to countries that give weapons to our enemies?

In the Syrian civil war, we went in on the side of those who were opposed to Assad. Now, Assad is no saint, no Democrat, no Jeffersonian Democrat, no believer in freedom; yet the people on the other side—most of them hate Israel. Most of them despise any rights for women. Most of them—many of them are allied with al-Qaida. Who is al-Qaida? The people who attacked us on 9/11. Al-Nusra, al-Qaida, ISIS—who do they get weapons from? Saudi Arabia and Qatar.

Even Hillary Clinton admitted this in one of the emails that were released. Hillary Clinton was talking to John Podesta by email, and she said: We have to do something about this. Saudi Arabia and Qatar are arming and providing logistical help to ISIS.

So why does it go on? Some would say: Because people make a big profit on this. This is a jobs program for the arms industry, and we have to make sure they make their profit.

I disagree. This is an industry that uniquely has to do with our national interests. It is uniquely paid for by the taxpayer. These weapons are owned by the taxpayer, and we should not sell them to people who are not our friends.

This is what the debate is about today. We will vote shortly on whether or not we should sell offensive weapons to Saudi Arabia.

What are they doing with the weapons? Well, they are bombing civilians in Yemen, for one. They are transferring some of the weapons in Yemen to al-Qaida. Al-Qaida and the larger umbrella group that attacked us on 9/11 are active. They are called AQAP in Yemen. There are news reports in the last week that Saudi Arabia is indiscriminantly giving arms to anybody who is opposed to the group they are fighting against, the Houthis.

Who supports the Houthis? The Iranians.

Is one side better than the other?

Are we so blind to the malign influence of Saudi Arabia that we give money and weapons to anybody regardless of what they do? You can chop up a dissident. You can cut a dissident up to pieces with a bone saw, and we will still give you weapons?

My goodness, I can't imagine. I do not think that people in this body who will continue to sell weapons to Saudi Arabia are listening to the people at home. I guarantee, if we asked the people at home, if we had a national poll and everybody got to give their opinion, how many people at home do you think are saying: Oh, well, they just chopped up a dissident—no big deal. Let's just keep sending them weapons. Oh, well, they are giving weapons to Hamas. Yes, you know, we don't really care. Or, well, they are bombing civilians.

The Saudis killed 150 people at a funeral procession—people marching at a funeral procession. They knew it was a funeral procession. This was no fog of war, no mistake. This was an intentional act to kill people at a funeral procession. There were 150 people killed and 450 wounded. About 1 year ago, they killed 40 schoolchildren on a schoolbus.

They are indiscriminately bombing civilians, and they are blockading Yemen, which is one of the poorest countries on the planet. Millions of people—some estimate between 14 and 17 million people—live on the edge of starvation because of this war. The Saudis are preventing food from coming in. They have blockaded Hodeida, which is one of the key ports where food needs to come in. Yemen imports 80 percent of their food. The Saudis are blockading them and people are starving, and we are allied with Saudis. We supply them with bombs that they drop on civilians and until the last few months we were refueling the very planes that were dropping the bombs.

People talk sometimes about, you know, a dream of peace in the Middle East. If you want to have a peace plan in the Middle East, people say: Well, it is Israel and Palestine who have to come to a peace agreement.

Do you know what the bigger problem is—an even bigger problem than that conundrum—which is a conundrum? It is figuring out how to have peace between Saudi Arabia and their allies and Iran. Everything around here is Iran, Iran, Iran, Iran. Do you know who spends the third-most amount of money on the military in the world? Saudi Arabia. First, it is the United States. We spend more than the next 10 countries combined. We spend more than all the rest of NATO combined, for that matter. Then, a distant second is China, and, then, there is Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia spends more on their military than Russia and more than most of our NATO allies. Yet people say: Oh, we have to give them more arms because Iran is a bad actor. What if they are both bad actors?

Currently, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf sheikdoms around them spend 8 times more than Iran. I am not saying Iran is a great place or that the government is great. What I am saying is, when you have two bad actors, when you have two malign influences, do you think we always have to choose the lesser of two evils? Do we have to always look askance and say: Oh, whatever—you know, as long as we are doing something that is opposed to Iran.

One of our other so-called allies over there is Bahrain. We have a naval base there, and we say: It is important to have a naval base, and we have to look the other way. They have 4,000 political prisoners. Saudi Arabia actually imprisons people for political reasons, and they don't just kill them. They behead them and crucify them—I think, in that order. They put the bodies out for public display.

They executed a guy named Sheikh Nimr al-Nimr, who was of a minority religion. The Saudis are Sunnis. This guy was a Shia religious person and spokesman. He was executed. His nephew is being held in prison and has been for several years now. He was 17 when he was arrested. His crime was sending a text message to encourage people to protest against the authoritarian regime of Saudi Arabia.

I think the problem is that some people come to the conclusion that arms are always good and we should never do anything to condition the sale of arms to behavior. Well, I am not for sending more arms there, period, because it is a cauldron always threatening to boil over.

Let's say you were someone who would say: Oh, no, we have to arm them. Perhaps we should condition arms on good behavior. Perhaps, if you are cutting up a dissident with a bone saw in a foreign country, maybe we should stop arms for a while to see if maybe you can get better people in the government or maybe to see if your ways will change.

Saudi Arabia said: Oh, we are doing it differently now. We are not going to fund radical jihadism around the world.

But they spent $100 billion infecting the world with the ideas of hatred of the West, hatred of Christians, hatred of Jews, and hatred of Hindus. There used to be a couple hundred of these schools in Pakistan. There is now said to be 20,000 schools in Pakistan. The Saudis support schools not just in Pakistan but throughout the world—in Indonesia and India and all over the Middle East. They support these schools that teach intolerance and hatred of the West. Yet we are one of their biggest arms suppliers. It makes utterly no sense, and it should be reconsidered.

We will have a chance to vote today, and the numbers are growing. When I first introduced a resolution to disapprove of arm sales to Saudi Arabia, I think I got 22 votes. We did it again a couple of months later, and I think we got in the forties. I think there is a chance today that we will get close to 60 votes.

We will have to get to 67 to overcome a Presidential veto. Look, I am a big fan of the President on many fronts, but on this someone has to stand up, even a Member of his own party and say: Arms sales are not jobs programs, and they should be conditioned on behavior, and we should not sell arms to countries that hate us.

As for these countries that burn our flag and chant ''Death to America,'' we shouldn't be arming them.

At one point in time, there were reports about ISIS. Remember the people who were beheading people in the desert over the last couple of years and spreading throughout the region? There were reports that they have $1 billion worth of Humvees. Some of them were captured, but some came because of indiscriminate arms. There are arms everywhere.

So when we had the Syrian civil war going on, all throughout the news media—public, private, everywhere—everyone was saying that Saudi Arabia and Qatar were giving arms to anybody, indiscriminantly giving arms to people. One of the groups that got arms and one of the groups that got anti-tank weapons—these are shoulder-launched missiles—said in a news report right after they got them: When we are done with Assad—they didn't talk about ISIS, and most of them didn't care about ISIS because they actually kind of agree with ISIS's religion—we are going after Israel next.

So we are arming people who are potential if not real enemies of Israel. We are arming people who are teaching hatred of the West, hatred of Christians, hatred of Hindus, and hatred of Jews. We are arming these people. Why are we doing that?

Let's say you don't agree with everything I have said, and you say: Well, maybe we should get them to behave better. Why don't you withhold arms for 6 months at the least?

Why don't we just stop for a while?

They have enough arms to blow up the Middle East 10 times over. Is there just no stopping? Is there no limitation to what we will do? Do we not believe that any of our arms sales should be conditioned on behavior?

This is a big deal and a big vote, and it is my hope that the American people will watch how people vote and decide: Is this who I want representing me? Do I want someone representing me who is selling arms to people who hate our country, who spend hundreds of billions of dollars on schools teaching hatred of our country? Do I want to have people representing me who continue to flood the Middle East with arms?

That is what this vote is about, and I hope the American public will pay attention to how people vote today and to which direction they want the country to go in.

We have had enough war. This is something I agree with the President on. We have had enough war. We have

been at war too long in too many places.

We have been 19 years in Afghanistan, and to what end? I was for the initial purpose of getting those who attacked us on 9/11. I would have voted to go. But after 19 years, it is nation-building. We are spending $50 billion a year. We build roads, and they blow them up. We build schools, and they blow them up.

We have roads and schools crumbling in our country. We don't have an extra $50 billion to spend in Afghanistan. We are $1 trillion short this year. We are going to spend $4 trillion, and we are bringing in $1 trillion—not great economics, not great budget balancing on our part.

No. 1, we cannot afford to try to be everywhere all the time, and, No. 2, the money we are spending overseas is counterproductive.

We went into Iraq and toppled a dictator. What did we get? Chaos. In the chaos we get ISIS and other groups forming.

We went into Libya and toppled the dictator in Libya. What did we get? Chaos. It is so confusing in Libya that I am not even sure which side the U.S. Government is supporting. They were supporting the U.N.-sanctioned government and now they appear to be supporting military generals who are trying to overthrow that government.

One thing is for sure: The country of Qatar that we voted to send arms to last week is supporting the side opposite us. So we give arms to people who are directly involved in a civil war where we are involved on the other side of the civil war. To me, it seems utterly preposterous that we keep doing that. There is Qatar's support for the other side in Libya and their support for Hamas. They are letting ISIS and al-Qaida do fundraising in their country.

Maybe we need to take a break from the arms race in the Middle East.

I don't think that someone can make a practical or reasonable argument that there has been more peace since we sent more weapons over there. They have plenty of weapons to kill each other for another thousand years. They have been killing each other for 1,000 years. They have enough weapons to kill each other for another 1,000 years.

Maybe we don't need to be involved in every civil war in the world. Maybe we can't afford it, and maybe when we have gotten involved, we had the unintended consequences of actually making it worse.

People have this idea that when you topple a dictator, somehow the next person they elect is going to be Thomas Jefferson. Well, guess what. Every time we have toppled a dictator, the people they end up electing are not Thomas Jefferson. Sometimes in the elections we don't like whom they elected in the elections and people go back and topple them again.

So when Egypt actually had an election, they elected somebody from the Muslim Brotherhood. Many in the Middle East and many in our country didn't want him. So we helped to get rid of him, and now we have a military rule with no elections and with the idea that you can be detained without trial. People say: Well, it is stable. It is another military autocracy, but we are going to put up with it.

We need to rethink our approach to the Middle East. We need to rethink the approach that we need to arm one or both sides in every war. We need to think whether regime change is a good idea, and we need to look at the practical effects of our foreign policy and say: Are we safer somehow?

I think one universal truth is that we are usually poorer by the time we are done, because what we end up doing is spending good money after bad.

I will give you a couple of examples in Afghanistan. In Afghanistan we spent $90 million in a luxury hotel in downtown Kabul. You say: How does that $90 million hotel protect us? Well, it doesn't, but it is money. Money runs through all this. Somebody is getting rich, but not the American taxpayer.

The guy who built it, I think, was a Jordanian national, but he built a shell of a hotel. He took the $90 million. He got all the payment, and it was never built. It mostly doesn't have walls, and none of it was completed. It is now a danger because it sits up across from our embassy and snipers crawl up in the building.

So the thing is that we asked for $90 million, and we need more now because, apparently, we now need to tear it down because it is a danger to our embassy and our soldiers.

So if we could just get $200,000 more, they are going to spend another couple hundred thousand dollars tearing down a hotel that we asked you to build in the first place, which we had no business building whatsoever.

We built a gas station for them in Afghanistan, too. But because our purpose in the military is now sometimes to fight the enemy but also to fight climate change—you didn't know this, but part of the military's goal is climate change now—so we built them a gas station. But we want to reduce the carbon footprint. So we built a gas station that sells natural gas. Well, the problem was, No. 1, nobody in Afghanistan has a car. The average income is about $800. Almost nobody has a car, and no one has one that burns natural gas.

So what they did is that they had to give them credit cards and buy them cars that actually ran on natural gas.

We wanted to visit over there and the military said it was too dangerous to take us there. So we have no idea if it is even in operation at this point.

I say we need to rethink this, and I urge today a vote against selling more arms to Saudi Arabia.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will be voting in support of the resolutions of disapproval, and let me tell you why. A strategic relationship with the United States should be coveted, and the difference between a relationship and a strategic relationship is very important.

We deal with people all the time that engage in practices that we don't like, abhor, and are against. Sometimes you have to sit down and talk with Putin about Syria. Sometimes you have to sit down and talk with the Chinese, even though they imprison the Uighurs. And there are even more egregious examples of the people you have to deal with, because that is part of the world as it is. But when you have a strategic relationship—and we have had one with Saudi Arabia for years—it is different.

What brings me here today? I want the people in Saudi Arabia—I have many friends there. I value my relationships there.

I appreciate all that Saudi Arabia has done in the past to work with the United States, militarily and otherwise, but I want to be clear to my friends in Saudi Arabia—and really throughout the world—a strategic relationship has certain requirements attached to it. You don't have to run your country like the United States would have you do. You don't have to mirror the United States in terms of your values, but you do have to respect the relationship.

There are certain minimum requirements that I think come with a strategic relationship: No. 1, you cannot kill somebody in the most brutal fashion in a consulate of another country—which violates every norm known to the international community—because they wrote a bad article about you.

You cannot imprison people and torture them in the fashion that has been going on in Saudi Arabia.

You cannot hold the Prime Minister of another country captive for a period of time to bend them to your will.

You cannot rendition people that just simply oppose your views. Terrorism cannot be defined as simple dissent.

The reason I am voting with Senator PAUL and others today is to send a signal to Saudi Arabia that if you act the way you are acting, there is no space for a strategic relationship. There is no amount of oil you can produce that will get me and others to give you a pass on chopping somebody up in a consulate. Did MBS do it? Yes—not because the U.N. said so but because our intelligence and my common sense lead me to believe there is no other viable alternative. You can figure this one out pretty quickly.

What happens next? It cannot be business as usual. Saudi Arabia has been a partner. They will have to be a partner in the future. Shooting rockets into Saudi Arabia from Yemen—Iran supporting the Houthi rebels—bothers me. Defensive armaments, I support, but the war in Yemen is out of control.

I am trying to deliver the strongest message I know how to deliver: Don't take this relationship for granted—and obviously you have.

It is disrespectful to the President of the United States to put him in this position. It is disrespectful to all the allies in Congress for you to put us in this position. Clearly, you don't care that much about this relationship. You care more about the critics and maintaining power at any and all cost.

Here is the deal: My relationship with Saudi Arabia is forever changed, and it will not go back to the way it used to be until Saudi Arabia changes its behavior. The leadership of Saudi Arabia has charted a course that is unsustainable. I reject. There is no amount of oil that can be produced to change my view that our values are more important than oil. We can get oil from other people, but your values come from within.

There is no amount of threat coming from Iran that is going to require me to give a pass to this brutal, barbaric behavior. More is expected of a strategic partner. Saudi Arabia doesn't protect the United States from Iran. To believe otherwise is recasting conditions on the ground.

Saudi Arabia has been a partner. I hope they can be in the future, but Saudi Arabia, through their leadership, made a tremendously bad decision, and it is just not Mr. Khashoggi. Until you change in Saudi Arabia, until you embrace the concept that the strategic relationship with the United States is important, therefore, I must respect it—I am not telling you how to run your country. I am not saying you have to be a Jeffersonian democracy. I respect the right of self-determination by all people, but I will not bless or turn a blind eye to brutality that, in my view, disqualifies a person or a country from being a strategic partner.

If this doesn't do it, what would? If we give this a pass, what is next?

We are going to stand up to the thugs in Iran. We are going to push back against China's cheating. We are going after al-Qaida, ISIS, and all the other bad actors on the planet. We are going to work with people we don't like, but when it comes to a strategic partnership, we need to put the world on notice: It comes with a minimum price, and that price is you cannot have a strategic relationship with the United States and behave in a fashion that shows no respect for human dignity, no respect for international norms.

You have lost me, and that is too bad. I have been on this floor a lot standing up for our friends in Saudi Arabia—which has not always been easy to do—but the days of treating Saudi Arabia the way I used to treat them are over.

My hope is we can find a way to restart this relationship, but it is going to require change. That is why I am voting to support these resolutions.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor again to urge my colleagues to stand up for Congress as a coequal branch of government and assert our institutional rights in the arms sales process.

I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have joined with me in this effort to bring us here today.

As we get ready to vote on these resolutions, I want to again remind my colleagues what is at stake here. At the end of the day, these votes are not about any one President or any one arms sale. There will be another President in the White House someday. There will be another President who will want to claim Executive authorities to run over Congress and who will want to use emergency declarations to push through their agenda. We in this body must embrace our article I responsibilities and ensure that we serve as an effective check on whoever that Executive is.

Regarding these resolutions, in particular, we must both assert our role in upholding the rule of law at home and use our position to ensure that when our government seeks to sell weapons, those sales advance our national security interests and our values. It is the Congress that provided the President with the authority to sell arms while retaining strong oversight in the process.

At the risk of getting in the weeds, I want to briefly explain why Secretary Pompeo's 22 emergency certifications don't meet the basic requirements laid out by Congress in the Arms Export Control Act. I will be submitting a further statement for the RECORD detailing my statutory concerns, and I encourage my colleagues to read it.

First of all, Secretary Pompeo provided us with one single emergency declaration for 22 separate arms sales, when the law requires each come with its own individual justification. It is obvious why the Secretary flouted the statute: His bogus emergency doesn't pass the laugh test, in general. Furthermore, the Secretary is trying to justify these sales by relying on a section of the Arms Export Control Act—article 36(c)—that arguably does not grant him the authority to do what he is even trying to do.

Congress made fairly clear back in 2000 that this provision only allows for the United States to make emergency arms sales in very limited situations—for example, to sell arms to NATO partners and other steadfast allies that share our values, like Israel, Australia, and Japan.

This is a power grab, pure and simple, with lasting implications for the role of Congress in the sale of arms around the world. We cannot, as an institution, stand for it.

Let me turn to the proposed sales. As a number of my colleagues and I have already laid out, the administration's argument that this is an emergency meriting pushing through $8 billion worth of arms sales to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates simply does not pass muster.

The weapons sales this administration is trying to push through without congressional review will not in any way equip the United States or our allies to better face any imminent threats from Iran.

The Assistant Secretary of State, R. Clarke Cooper, admitted as much multiple times last week before the House of Representatives. In one instance, he noted that the administration had been considering this emergency determination for months. In another, he conceded that a majority of these sales will not even be functional or come online for months or, even in some cases, years.

Let's take a moment to review why last year I decided to put a hold on a sale of 60,000 precision-guided munition kits. Saudi Arabia, at the helm of its coalition, has used these weapons to devastating effects in Yemen. The two resolutions we will consider individually relate to the sales of precision-guided munitions and parts.

We have heard that these weapons are humanitarian weapons. When they are used to precisely target civilians, how can we possibly continue to sell them? These are components of bombs that we know have killed thousands of civilians in Yemen—patients in hospitals, children on schoolbuses. In fact, the Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project last week released data showing more than 90,000 people have been killed in Yemen since 2015. The list goes on.

Yemen has become a humanitarian catastrophe. Twelve thousand people have died under the Saudi-led coalition. There are 85,000 children who have died from starvation in Yemen, an incomprehensible moral tragedy. Another 14 million people remain at risk, especially as cholera resurges across the country.

This is the challenge we have. It is our bombs that are dropping on those civilians. We cannot morally continue to support such a sale.

Secondly, Saudi Arabia, which continues to do this with impunity, also with impunity went ahead and dismembered Jamal Khashoggi, a journalist who was a resident here in the United States. The gruesome report of the U.N. Special Rapporteur on this issue is chilling. If the Senate wants to make it very clear that even if you are an ally, you cannot kill with impunity, this is the moment.

It is also the moment to tell the UAE that you can't take our weapons and give it to others whom we consider people on the terrorist list. That is going on here too.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for the Constitution, stand up for article I in our rights here, stand up for the Senate's institutional role to ultimately ensure that it has a say on arms sales, stand up for the proposition that we will not let any ally, simply because they are an ally, kill a journalist with impunity—something we cherish under our Constitution and the Bill of Rights and the freedom of expression under the First Amendment—and stand up for the proposition that we will not let our bombs fall on innocent civilians and have the moral responsibility, which will be a blemish on our history for years to come.

This is the moment for the Senate to stand up to its institutional prerogatives. This is the moment for the Senate to stand up for the Constitution. I have heard so many of my colleagues speak of the Constitution. This is the moment. This is the moment to stand up for some moral clarity.

This is the moment to send a global message: You cannot kill journalists with impunity. That is the message we must send to Saudi Arabia.

Vote yes on the resolutions of disapproval. Stand up for these propositions. Let's have a moment in which the Senate can be a profile in courage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, in just a few moments, we are going to consider S.J. Res. 28 through S.J. Res. 48. I urge my colleagues to oppose these resolutions and to consider the sales that we are talking about here on their own merits.

First of all, we are not talking about the killing of Mr. Khashoggi. That was a murderous act; it was an awful act; and it cannot be condoned or tolerated in any way, shape, or form. Yet it is not what we are voting on here today. Indeed, we hope to eventually bring to the floor a resolution, possibly even a bill, that speaks to that horrific act. Those negotiations have been going on for some time, and we hope to reach a conclusion, but we are not talking about that. We are talking about arms sales that the administration has determined are needed—and on which we have all been briefed—because of the current situation in the Middle East.

I want to speak very briefly about recent events that have been happening as far as Iran is concerned. Iran is conducting activities that are very worrisome and very troubling. When you have these kinds of things happen, it is obvious that a miscalculation can occur, which is the most worrisome thing here.

In any event, these arms sales are needed. To be clear, in the current statute, the administration is within its legal authority to declare an emergency. As stipulated in the Arms Export Control Act, which was passed by this body, the President can act swiftly if he concludes an emergency exists that requires a proposed sale that is in the national security interest of the United States. That has occurred.

Presidential authority to waive congressional notification was invoked for the very first time by President Carter in 1979. It has been used on three other subsequent occasions. The administration has said, as in those cases, this is a one-time invocation of the waiver authority in response to an acute threat from Iran. The administration has since returned to the regular congressional notification process for further arms sales, which is in place today.

These sales are needed to address the legitimate security requirements of other countries we support in response to there being numerous threats from Iran and its proxies. These threats are real. As the events over just even the recent 24 hours have shown us, it is important that these countries be ready to assist us and to act on their own behalf to counter what Iran has been doing.

Yesterday, Iranian-backed Houthi militants struck a Saudi civilian desalinization plant with a land attack cruise missile.

Last night, Iranian forces shot down a U.S. drone that was operating in international airspace over the Strait of Hormuz. It is the third U.S. aircraft they have targeted in recent weeks.

Last week, using limpet mines, Iran attacked two oil tankers that were traveling near the Strait of Hormuz. Yesterday, German Chancellor Merkel cited strong evidence that attributes that attack to Iran. There are very few people in the world who don't know for a fact that it has been Iran that has been responsible for all of this.

On that same day last week, the Iranian-supported Houthis fired a missile at Abha International Airport, in southern Saudi Arabia, and wounded 26 innocent Saudi civilians. Human Rights Watch announced this Houthi attack as a war crime.

On May 19, a rocket—likely by Iran's proxies—landed near the American Embassy in Baghdad.

On May 14, Iran's proxies used drones to strike two strategically important Saudi oil facilities.

Just 2 days earlier, on May 12, four more tankers were targeted by Iran while they were anchored in an Emirati port.

Each month, Iranian-sponsored Houthi rebels launch over 15 ballistic missiles and weaponized, unmanned aerial systems against Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. This poses a significant threat and endangers the lives of 80,000 Americans who reside on the Arabian Peninsula.

These are the most recent examples of Iran's destabilizing actions on the world stage. These are serious, serious matters. As I said before, this is worrisome; this is troubling. The miscalculation of these kinds of things cause hostilities that lead to very large wars.

As Iran thinks through these things and calibrates them and tries to make determinations as to what is in its best interest, it is not going well. If you listen to Iran's public statements, they clearly do not coincide with facts. More importantly, Iran is miscalculating the resolve of the American people. It is miscalculating the fact that it is dealing with President Trump; it is not dealing with a former President.

I have talked to the President about this many times. He does not want to go to war with Iran. The American people don't want to go to war with Iran. This body does not want to go to war with Iran. This President is absolutely committed to protecting U.S. lives and U.S. interests, and he will do so. Iran should not miscalculate on that matter, for the President is deeply committed to that proposition.

Iran needs to back away from the edge that it has taken everyone to and deal with this matter entirely differently than it has, or there are going to be dire consequences.

In the face of the attacks I have described and the intimidation, our allies have an obligation to develop capabilities to protect their citizens from such threats. These arms sales are an essential part of our effort in helping them build those capabilities and resist Iranian intimidation.

I share my fellow Senators' concerns about the humanitarian crisis in Yemen and the need for all combatants to avoid civilian casualties. This package includes the sales of precision weapons, which, when combined with partner efforts to improve intelligence in targeting, will enable those who use the weapons to ensure their actions are precise, discriminate, and proportional so as to minimize civilian casualties. The precision munitions in these sales would also prove to be essential to other countries' efforts in defending themselves from more direct attacks from Iran.

Some of us have been briefed by U.S. personnel who have worked specifically with the Saudis to make these improvements, and I encourage my colleagues to have similar conversations. If you care about reducing civilian casualties, you should be an enthusiastic supporter of providing these exacting capabilities, which will be transferred pursuant to these sales. These are important for reducing civilian casualties, and we should all support them.

In closing, I will repeat several key points.

First, the emergency declaration is legal.

Second, these sales are necessary to answer for the legitimate security requirements of other nations that work to keep safe our fellow Americans who work, travel, and live around the world.

Third, to reject these sales at this time and under these circumstances is to reward recent Iranian aggression, to encourage further Iranian escalation, and most importantly, to encourage the miscalculation on the part of the Iranians, which will be disastrous if

they continue down the road they are going.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote against these resolutions.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 36

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read S.J. Res. 36 for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 177 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Jones	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lee	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Graham	Murray	Wyden
Harris	Paul	Young
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—45

Alexander	Enzi	Perdue
Barrasso	Ernst	Portman
Blackburn	Fischer	Risch
Blunt	Gardner	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Romney
Braun	Hawley	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Sasse
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Isakson	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Sullivan
Cramer	Kennedy	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Gillibrand	Rounds

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 36

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of a manufacturing license, technical assistance license, or export license with respect to any of the following proposed agreements or transfers to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1427 (EC–1427) submitted to Congress pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019:

(A) Coproduction and manufacture in Saudi Arabia of Paveway Pre-Amp Circuit Card Assemblies (CCA), Guidance Electronics Assembly (GEA) CCAs, and Control Actuator System (CAS) CCAs for all Paveway variants.

(B) Coproduction and manufacture in Saudi Arabia of Paveway II Guidance Electronics Detector Assemblies (GEDA) and Computer Control Groups (CCG).

(C) The transfer of up to 64,603 additional kits, partial kits, and full-up-rounds.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 38

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read S.J. Res. 38 for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 178 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Jones	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lee	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Graham	Murray	Wyden
Harris	Paul	Young
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—45

Alexander	Cotton	Hawley
Barrasso	Cramer	Hoeven
Blackburn	Crapo	Hyde-Smith
Blunt	Cruz	Inhofe
Boozman	Daines	Isakson
Braun	Enzi	Johnson
Burr	Ernst	Kennedy
Capito	Fischer	Lankford
Cassidy	Gardner	McConnell
Cornyn	Grassley	McSally
Perdue	Rubio	Sullivan
Portman	Sasse	Thune
Risch	Scott (FL)	Tillis
Roberts	Scott (SC)	Toomey
Romney	Shelby	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Gillibrand	Rounds

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 38

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1422 (EC–1422) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support the manufacture of the Aurora Fuzing System for the Paveway IV Precision Guided Bomb Program.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 27, S.J. RES. 28, S.J. RES. 29, S.J. RES. 30, S.J. RES. 31, S.J. RES. 32, S.J. RES. 33, S.J. RES. 34, S.J. RES. 35, S.J. RES. 37, S.J. RES. 39, S.J. RES. 40, S.J. RES. 41, S.J. RES 42, S.J. RES. 43, S.J. RES. 44, S.J. RES 45, S.J. RES. 46, S.J. RES. 47, AND S.J. RES. 48 EN BLOC

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read for the third time the remaining disapproval resolutions en bloc by number.

The joint resolutions were ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and were read the third time.

The joint resolutions having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolutions pass?

Mr. WYDEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 179 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Carper	Feinstein
Bennet	Casey	Graham
Blumenthal	Collins	Harris
Booker	Coons	Hassan
Brown	Cortez Masto	Heinrich
Cantwell	Duckworth	Hirono
Cardin	Durbin	Jones

Kaine	Murray	Smith
King	Paul	Stabenow
Klobuchar	Peters	Tester
Leahy	Reed	Udall
Manchin	Rosen	Van Hollen
Markey	Sanders	Warner
Menendez	Schatz	Warren
Merkley	Schumer	Whitehouse
Moran	Shaheen	Wyden
Murphy	Sinema	Young

NAYS—45

Alexander	Ernst	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Cramer	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Blackburn	Lee
Gillibrand	Rounds

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 27) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 27

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, and Australia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1424 (EC–1424) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support the marketing, sale and on-going support for the ScanEagle and Integrator Unmanned Aerial Systems and for future Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) requirements for end-use by the United Arab Emirates Armed Forces; and hardware and defense services related to Wide Area Surveillance Payload (Redkite), laser designator, and integration of maritime search payload—Visual Detection and Ranging (ViDAR).

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 28

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 17–39, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of 20 RQ–21A Blackjack Unmanned Air Vehicles (UAVs); 40 Global Positioning Systems (GPS) with Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) Type II (MPE–S); air vehicle support equipment including 8 Ground Control Stations (GCS), 4 launchers, and 4 retrievers; spare and repair parts; publications; training; and technical support services.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 29

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 19–01, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of follow-on logistics support and service for the Royal Saudi Air Force aircraft, engines, and weapons; publications and technical documentation; support equipment; spare and repair parts; repair and return; calibration support and test equipment; personnel equipment; United States Government and contractor technical and logistics support; and other elements of program support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 30) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 30

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 19–18, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of a blanket-order United States Marine Corps training, training support, and other training related services in support of the United Arab Emirates Presidential Guard Command.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 31

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 18–31, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of spare and repair parts, United States Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of program support for the Tactical Air Surveillance System aircraft program.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 32

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 18–21, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of follow-on support and services for Royal Saudi Air Force aircraft, engines, and weapons; publications and technical documentation; support equipment; spare and repair parts; repair and return; calibration support and test equipment; personnel equipment; United States Government and contractor technical and logistics support; and other related elements of program support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 33

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 17–73, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of 20,004 Advanced Precision Kill Weapon Systems (APKWS) II All-Up-Rounds; weapons support and test equipment; spares; technical publications; personnel training; other training equipment; transportation; United States Government and contractor engineering; technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 34) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 34

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 17–70, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of 331 Javelin Guided Missiles with container; System Integration and Checkout (SICO) service; Field Service Representative; United States Government and contractor technical and logistic support services' tools and test equipment; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 17–0B, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of 28 AH–64E Remanufactured Apache Attack Helicopters; 10 new AH–64E Apache Attack Helicopters; 76 T700–GE–701D Engines (56 remanufactured, 18 new, 6 spares, 2 installed); 40 AN/ASQ–170 Modernized Target Acquisition and Designation Sight/AN/AAR–11 Modernized Pilot Night Vision Sensors (28 remanufactured, 10 new, 2 spares); 32 remanufactured AN/APR–48B Modernized Radar Frequency Interferometers; 47 AAR–57 Common Missile Warning Systems (31 remanufactured, 10 new, 6 spares); 150 Embedded Global Positioning Systems with Inertial Navigation (60 remanufactured, 74 new, 16 spares); 45 Manned-Unmanned Teaming-International (MUMTi) systems (28 remanufactured, 10 new, 7 spares); and 15 new MUMTi System Upper Receivers, training devices, helmets, simulators, generators, transportation, wheeled vehicles and organization equipment, spare and repair parts,

support equipment, tools and test equipment, technical data and publications, personnel training and training equipment, United States Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 37

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to any of the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, or France is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1425 (EC–1425) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of 44,000 GBU–12 Paveway II Kits and the proposed transfer of 16,000 GBU–10 Paveway II Kits.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 39

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom is prohibited:

(1) The transfer to the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom of the following export of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services, described in Executive Communication 1426 (EC–1426) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposal to amend a technical assistance agreement to support the installation, integration, modification, maintenance, and repair of F110–GE–132 gas turbine engines for use in F–16 Aircraft by the General Headquarters of the Armed Forces of the United Arab Emirates.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 40

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed export to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of the following license for export of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services, described in Executive Communication 1417 (EC–1417) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed manufacturing agreement with Huneed Technologies Company, Ltd. in South Korea to transfer defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support manufacture, production, test, inspection, modification, enhancement, rework, and repair of F/A18E/F and derivative series aircraft panels for end use by the Boeing Company.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 41) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 41

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates of the following license for export of technical data and defense services, described in Executive Communication 1419 (EC–1419) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed technical assistance agreement providing technical data and defense services to Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates in support of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia Ministry of Defense Transformation Project.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 42) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 42

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to any of the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is prohibited:

(1) The transfer to the United Arab Emirates and to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of the following defense articles, including technical data and defense services, described in Executive Communication 1421 (EC–1421) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed technical assistance agreement with Armed Forces of the United Arab Emirates to transfer defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support preparation shipment, delivery, and acceptance of the Guidance Enhanced (GEM–T) in support of the Patriot Program for end use by the Government of the United Arab Emirates.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 43) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 43

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1418 (EC–1418) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of technical data and defense services in order to provide technically qualified personnel to advise and assist the Royal Saudi Air Force (RSAF) in maintenance and training for the RSAF F–15 fleet of aircraft.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 44) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 44

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed retransfer of defense articles from the United Arab Emirates to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is prohibited:

(1) The retransfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1428 (EC–1428) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2753(d)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed retransfer of 500 Paveway II laser guided bombs (including Mk–82 warheads, FMU–152A/B fuzes, and guidance kits) from the United Arab Emirates to Jordan.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 45) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 45

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1416 (EC–1416) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed export of 15,000 120mm M933A1 mortar bombs to Saudi Arabia for end use by the Royal Land Forces of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 46) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 46

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1415 (EC–1415) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed export of 100 M107A1 .50 caliber semiautomatic rifles and sound suppressors to the United Arab Emirates for use by the Armed Forces General Headquarters of the United Arab Emirates.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 47

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1423 (EC–1423) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed export of defense articles, including data and defense services, to support the performance of maintenance and repair services of F110 engines to support the Ministry of Defense of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 48

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1420 (EC–1420) submitted to Congress pursuant to

section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support the export and integration of 60,000 FMU–152A/B Joint Programmable Bomb Fuze systems into the United Arab Emirates Armed Forces General Headquarters' fleet of the following aircraft and associated weapons: F–16, Mirage 2000, AT–802 Air Tractor and S2R–600 Archangel.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the unfinished business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 1790, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:45 p.m. today the Senate vote on the confirmation of the Baranwal nomination, with all other provisions under the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, yesterday I had a chance to sit down with a group of my constituents visiting DC from the Rio Grande Valley. For those who have never been to the Rio Grande Valley, I highly recommend a visit. It is a beautiful region, a unique part of our country, rich in culture and history and full of hard-working people and businesses that fuel our State's and the Nation's thriving economy. As record numbers of people continue to mass migrate across our southern border, it has become one of the most heavily impacted areas in our country, and it is working hard to manage the growing humanitarian crisis.

Last month alone, 144,000 people were detained coming across our border. It was the largest monthly total since 2006. It only begins to paint the picture of how challenging this mass migration has become. The vast majority of the people who crossed last month were either unaccompanied children or families, putting a strain on resources across the border, particularly when it comes to detention facilities.

It is no mistake that the human smugglers, whom we call coyotes back home, have figured out that if you can smuggle an unaccompanied child or family across the border, you vastly improve the chances of successfully placing them in the United States. That is because they understand our laws better than many Members of Congress do, and they know how to exploit them for their financial gain.

The detention facilities I referred to a moment ago have been around a long time—long before the current surge of families and children began arriving at our borders. They were built as short-term detention facilities for single adults. As trends have changed, the men and women of Customs and Border Protection have done everything in their power to make these facilities workable on an increasingly thin and inadequate budget.

I want to pause for a moment to say thank you to the men and women in uniform who are providing around-the-clock enforcement of our laws and providing quality and compassionate care to the migrants in their custody. It is a tough job. When you train to be a Customs and Border Patrol agent, you are not trained in child care, but that is what many of them find themselves doing—handing out juice boxes and diapers and providing assistance to those families as they seek to have their claims for asylum adjudicated.

This is a tough job, and it is getting tougher every day, particularly in the Rio Grande Valley and along the border. Of the 144,000 crossings last month, nearly 50,000 were apprehended in the Rio Grande Valley, making it the most heavily impacted of the entire border.

In fact, it should come as no surprise that Texas is impacted more than any other State because, of course, we share a 1,200-mile common border with Mexico. Two-thirds of the apprehensions so far this fiscal year have occurred in the Rio Grande Valley, El Paso, or Del Rio sectors. As Federal resources have rapidly depleted, Customs and Border Protection officers and agents have struggled to manage the processing, care, and transportation of these migrants, and local communities, it should be no surprise, have stepped in.

The Humanitarian Respite Center in McAllen is one of several locations working to care for the migrants and has had its doors open for 5 years now. In the summer of 2014, we saw then-unprecedented numbers of Central Americans, particularly children, arriving at the border. This was back when President Obama called this a ''humanitarian and security crisis.'' The scenes were heartbreaking and spurred many folks to action to try to offer their help.

Sister Norma Pimentel is the executive director of Catholic Charities in the Rio Grande Valley and led the creation of this respite center. Migrants who are released by CBP or ICE and are awaiting a court date are often dropped off at the center by officers or agents themselves. There they can get food, a hot shower, a good night's sleep, and travel to wherever they are going to await their court date.

There is certainly a need for this type of assistance under the circumstances, and it has been in existence only 5 years. The respite center has helped more than 150,000 people and continues its work as more people cross the border each day.

The number of unaccompanied children who illegally entered the United States last month is higher than in any other month since the 2014 surge that I mentioned a moment ago. The weight felt by those trying to provide assistance is getting heavier and heavier. As Federal resources dwindle, local communities in the Rio Grande Valley and along the entire Texas-Mexico border have been filling the gaps, despite the fact that, obviously, immigration and the sovereignty of our borders are Federal responsibilities. In the absence of Federal response, it is the State and local communities that have had to step up to help.

Like the respite center in McAllen, these communities regularly provide care, transportation, food, and shelter for migrants in need. I believe this generosity shows the true Texas spirit and helps illustrate how serious the problem has become and how desperately additional Federal resources are needed.

Thankfully, yesterday the Appropriations Committee took action. The committee announced an agreement on a border supplemental package that will include humanitarian assistance needed at the border. The nearly $4.6 billion includes funding to support the missions of the Department of Health and Human Services, which is providing care for the record number of unaccompanied children who are arriving in the United States. It also provides funding for the Department of Homeland Security, which is working to enforce our laws and properly care for the adults and families in their custody, as well as the Departments of Justice and Defense. The hard-working men and women in these Departments are working tirelessly to care for the migrants in their custody, and I want to thank each of them for working day in and day out to enforce our laws. But, as I mentioned, these are not the only folks trying to provide support with minimal support from the U.S. Government.

Earlier this month I sent a letter to the chairman and ranking member of both the Appropriations Committee and the Homeland Security Subcommittee, requesting that the funding package include reimbursement for local communities that helped carry the weight of the humanitarian crisis. NGOs, nongovernmental organizations, like the respite center in McAllen are trying to do more and more with less and less. Cities and counties are diverting hard-to-come-by taxpayer dollars from their intended purposes, such as public safety, power, and clean drinking water, to do the job that is the responsibility of the Federal Government. It is unfair for these folks to pay for a humanitarian crisis that is not of their making. I am glad to see the Appropriations Committee taking some action to right this wrong.

The funding agreement yesterday includes $30 million available nationwide for direct reimbursement for local governments, States, and NGOs that have spent millions of dollars to respond to this crisis. Communities, both along the border and throughout the State of Texas, will be able to request reimbursement directly through local and national boards of the Emergency Food and Shelter Program at the Federal Emergency Management Agency to help lessen the financial burden they have incurred over the past few months.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member and all of our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for supporting this effort to help alleviate this strain on Texas communities. The funding bill received broad bipartisan support in the committee and passed by a vote of 30 to 1. I hope we will soon have the opportunity to pass this important funding bill here in the Senate. I encourage our friends in the House to put politics aside and do the same.

As happy as I am that the appropriations committee has come up with this additional money, this is still a matter of treating the symptoms and not the underlying cause. President Trump, in his frustrations with congressional inaction, threatened to impose additional tariffs on the nation of Mexico. Fortunately, the negotiations that ensued came up with a plan for Mexico to work with the United States to begin to slow down or stop the flow of people from Central America across Mexico into the United States.

I have never seen anything quite like that before in terms of our relationship with Mexico. They have historically tended to view immigration as our problem, not theirs, as well as the drug problem, because the demand in America is our problem and not theirs. This really represents a change of attitude on behalf of President Lopez Obrador's administration, and I want to congratulate President Lopez Obrador and his administration for working with the United States to address a joint problem. This is not just Mexico's problem. This is not just the problem of the United States. This is our shared challenge. Working together, I am confident we can begin to address it.

Finally, I want to say that Congress has largely been AWOL when it comes to dealing with this humanitarian crisis up to this point. A couple of months ago, my colleague from the House of Representatives, HENRY CUELLAR, a Democrat from Laredo, TX, and I introduced a bill we called the HUMANE Act, which would fix some of the gaps in our laws that are being exploited by the human smugglers and are causing this humanitarian crisis in this huge flood of humanity coming into the United States.

If Congress would accept its responsibility and do its job, it would never have been necessary for the President to threaten additional tariffs on Mexico, forcing this diplomatic negotiation. I am glad it resulted in a good and positive outcome, that negotiation, but the fault ultimately lies with Congress for not taking up and debating and voting on bipartisan legislation like the HUMANE Act that has been introduced in the Senate and in the House.

I will say that Chairman GRAHAM of the Judiciary Committee has been focused like a laser on this issue. We were scheduled to mark up a bill today in the Judiciary Committee that I believe would incorporate many provisions of the HUMANE Act as part of a bill which would, I believe, address this humanitarian pull factor because of exploitation of those gaps in our asylum laws. That now has been postponed, but I hope the discussions will continue because, ultimately, this is a matter of congressional responsibility. We can be glad that the Appropriations Committee stepped up and provided additional resources, including this $30 million in reimbursement for local communities. We can be glad that Mexico and the United States are finally now working together on this shared challenge, but ultimately, if we are going to address not just the symptoms but the causes of this humanitarian crisis, it is up to Congress. I believe the American people will ultimately hold us accountable, as they should.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Delaware.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GI BILL

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, this Saturday is June 22. It is not just any June 22. It marks 75 years to the day that Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed into law one of the most significant pieces of legislation in our Nation's history. It was called, and is called, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. We know it today as the GI bill.

Since 1944, the GI bill has helped literally millions of not just servicemen but a lot of servicewomen. When you look at our Armed Forces today, there are a lot of servicewomen who serve in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and in the Coast Guard. I remember being a midshipman at the Ohio State Navy ROTC in the 1960s, and we had no women in our unit. There were no women in any ROTC unit in colleges across the country, as far as I know. There were no women who were nominated to attend armed service academies—the Naval Academy, Air Force Academy, Merchant Marine Academy. None of them had women. I got to my squadron on the west coast during the Vietnam war, and we had about 300 men in my squadron. About 10 percent were officers. The others were enlisted men. We had no women in my squadron.

All that has changed. When you go to any college that has a ROTC unit today, they are allowing women in. In the academies, you find women. In my old squadron, we find women. They are not just E–1s, E–2s, and E–3s; they are O–4s, O–5s, O–6s, and they are doing a great job. The GI bill is for them too.

Since 1944, the GI bill has helped millions of World War II veterans purchase a home, pay for a higher education or obtain job training and, in turn, transformed our Nation's economy.

Our Presiding Officer, who has served our country in uniform, knows of what I speak. I was just off of Active Duty at the end of the Vietnam war and in Delaware when I finished up my MBA, which is financed in part by the GI bill. I had scraped enough money together to buy a house. I think it cost about $35,000. I didn't have $35,000, but with the help of the GI bill, I was able to get a mortgage and buy my first home, all those years ago.

In the years since World War II, the GI bill has continued to change the lives of millions of veterans by spurring economic opportunity and helping to create the middle class as we know it today. That is why earlier this week I was proud to reintroduce a bipartisan resolution in the Senate, alongside my colleagues Senators JOHNNY ISAKSON of Georgia and JON TESTER of Montana. They are the chair and ranking member of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which designates this week as National GI Bill Commemoration Week, celebrating the historical significance of the GI bill and renewing our commitment to improving the lives of our Nation's veterans for years to come.

I want to share with you a couple of reasons why the GI bill is oftentimes referred to as the ''greatest legislation'' and share with you how it changed my life and really the life of my family.

After World War II, millions of returning veterans flooded our Nation's colleges, our universities, and our vocational schools. It was the GI bill that made financial support, education, and homegrown programs available to those 16 million veterans returning home and helped to usher in an era of unprecedented economic expansion.

According to the 1988 report from the Joint Economic Committee, it was estimated that for every $1 the United States invested in our GIs through the GI bill, about $7 were returned in economic growth for our country.

I am going to say that again. According to the Joint Economic Committee in 1988, it was estimated, for every $1 the United States invested in the GI bill, about $7 were returned to our economy. It is a pretty good return.

Those are big returns. I wish I could say for every dollar we invested in Federal Government spending that we got seven bucks back, in terms of economic growth. We don't. So this is something to know.

Thanks to the original GI bill, 450,000 engineers, 240,000 accountants, 238,000 teachers, 91,000 scientists, 67,000 doctors, 112,000 dentists, and thousands of other professionals entered our country's workforce, and many folks entered the workforce with skills in building trades, in assembly operations. You name it.

The GI bill truly democratized our higher education system. It established greater citizenship and civic participation and empowered the ''greatest generation''—my parents' generation—to lead our country following World War II.

At the end of World War II, my dad was the chief petty officer in the Navy and served until the end of World War II and a little bit after that and served many years after that as a chief petty officer in the naval reserve for, I think, 30 years in all. He came back. Before he went to work, he took advantage of the GI bill, and he had a real knack for fixing things and building things. He was very skilled in that regard. He had a high school education. He and my mom graduated from Shady Springs High School in Beaver, WV. They were married during World War II. My sister was born in 1945, and I was born in 1947. My dad used the GI bill, he once told me, to learn how to fix wrecked cars, how to be an auto body repairman. He ended up working at an Oldsmobile dealership in Beckley, WV, Burleson Oldsmobile, using the skills he gained from the GI bill. He worked there for a year or two. One day, a claims adjuster came in from the Nationwide Insurance company. Nationwide insured a car that was being repaired by my dad. The claims adjuster talked to my dad about the car and how it was coming. Somewhere in that conversation, the fellow from Nationwide Insurance said: You know, you could do what I do.

My dad said: You mean be a claims adjuster for Nationwide Insurance?

The guy said: Yes, you could do this. You have a lot on the ball.

Two years later, my father was a claims adjuster for Nationwide Insurance. He continued to repair wrecked cars as a hobby. We had any number of cars in our family that looked as good as new. He would take them on weekends and went to a garage and fixed them, painted them, and they were as good as new.

Out of that humble beginning as a claims adjuster for Nationwide Insurance—he was very proud of the work he did, but he ended up 20, 25 years later as one of the top instructors for Nationwide in their home office in Columbus, OH, teaching all the claims adjusters from across the country for Nationwide how to do the job adjusting claims, working on claims.

Here is a picture of my dad, Wallace Richard Carper. He went by Richard, his middle name, my middle name. He instructed a bunch of folks in the home office in the training school in Columbus, OH. Here he is with some of his compadres, some of the fellow teachers whom he worked with. It started with the GI bill.

I know people who used the GI bill to get an undergraduate degree or 2-year degree, associate's degree, a master's degree, a Ph.D. Not everybody used the GI bill for that. My father used it in a way that actually ended up enabling him to not only get a good blue-collar job but also actually to end up doing this kind of work as well. I am proud of him and thankful to the GI bill for helping him get started and serve as a role model for my sister and me.

My own career, I served 5 years on Active Duty as a midshipman, before that at Ohio State, and served 5 years in the Vietnam war, three tours in Southeast Asia. I wanted to stay in the Navy. I wanted to go to graduate school after my career. The Navy wasn't ready to send me to Monterey. I wanted to go to Monterey to graduate school. The Navy wasn't ready to send me to a postgraduate school. They said to come back and talk to them in a couple of years.

I wanted to go to graduate school. I entered my regular commission, took a Reserve commission, and moved from California to Delaware—the University of Delaware—and enrolled on the GI bill to go to graduate school.

The next weekend, after I showed up in Delaware, I drove up the road to Willow Grove Naval Air Station in Pennsylvania, north of Philadelphia, and they were just getting the Navy P–3 aircraft. I had been a P–3 aircraft mission commander during the Vietnam war. I said: Are you looking for people who might help train these sailors at Willow Grove on how to use these P–3 airplanes?

He said: We need somebody. We need some help, and we are were happy to sign you up.

I flew with them for another 18 years and retired as a Navy captain.

Before I did those 18 years, I went to graduate school at the University of Delaware and earned an MBA, and that helped me go to work for the State of Delaware in economic development, right out of graduate school, and later had a chance to run for the State treasurer. Nobody wanted to run. In knowing I had an MBA from the University of Delaware, some people thought maybe I could be a pretty good State treasurer. We ended up starting with the worst credit rating in the country back in 1977, and 6 years later, we had doubled the credit rating. Pete du Pont was our Governor, and he was a great Governor.

I hope I helped a little bit along the way. That GI bill helped me in earning my MBA and, later, to have had a chance to have served in the House, then as Governor, and now here in the Senate. So I am deeply grateful to the people of this country for investing in me. I tried to work hard to repay that investment they made in me all those years ago.

Today's veterans can take advantage of the post-9/11 GI bill. It is an incredible benefit that pays the full cost of tuition at public colleges and universities, offers a generous housing allowance, and pays for books. It can even be transferred to veterans' spouses or children.

In 2017, I was proud when Congress enacted the Forever GI bill—legislation that expanded the GI bill and strengthened the protection for our veterans, for Purple Heart recipients, for National Guard reservists, and for surviving spouses and children.

About 2 or 3 weeks ago, we had a send-off ceremony in the Delaware National Guard facility in Smyrna, DE, which is just north of Dover. There were 20 or so National Guard men and women. They were about to ship off for Iraq and other surrounding countries in that part of the world.

In my remarks to send them off and wish them well, I mentioned, when they come home, they will be eligible for the GI bill if they have a total of 36 months of service, which will enable them to go to college for free—to the University of Delaware, to Delaware State University, or to the Delaware Technical Community College. There will be no tuition, and books will be paid for. If they need tutoring, it will be paid for, and they will receive a $2,000-a-month housing allowance.

When we came back from Southeast Asia at the end of the Vietnam war, in the GI bill, we received a $250-a-month allowance for everything. That was it. It was all there. The GI bill that our veterans inherit today, receive today, is just incredibly generous and is, actually, very helpful in terms of recruiting people to serve in an all-volunteer military.

One of the aspects of the bill that I mentioned a minute ago was, if a GI doesn't use his or her GI bill, his or her spouse can use it. If his or her spouse doesn't use it, his or her dependent children can use it. Sometimes that happens, and I want to share one sad but, in the end, hopeful story about one servicemember's GI benefits.

His name was Christopher Slutman. He grew up not too far from Delaware, but he ended up serving in New York City as a fireman and had been one for 15 years. In the words of Winston Churchill, he was twice a citizen because, in addition to doing that, he served in the Reserves for a number of years—not in the Navy but in the Marines.

His unit was activated. He was activated, and he ended up in Afghanistan on Active Duty. He took leave from his day job as a firefighter in New York City to put on a different uniform and ship out with his colleagues to go to Afghanistan. He was serving there on Active Duty—a marine reservist activated—when, one day while on patrol within the Humvee, they ran across a bomb that exploded and killed him, Christopher Slutman, and killed two other marines who were in the vehicle.

Along with CHRIS COONS, my colleague here in the Senate; LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER, our only Representative at large of the U.S. House of Representatives; our Governor, John Carney; the Secretary of Defense; the head of the Marine Corps; and a lot of other people, several days later, I stood on the flight line at Dover Air Force Base with the families of those three marines who died.

One of the people among the three families was Christopher Slutman's now widow. Shannon Metcalf Slutman was there, who has earned three degrees herself—her undergraduate from the University of Delaware, a master's degree, and a doctorate degree—and her three daughters were not. I think it was late at night. They were probably at home and probably in bed.

When Christopher Slutman died, he left behind a widow, and he left behind three little girls, ages 4, 8, and 10. His wife doesn't need to go to school any further. She is educated well beyond my dreams. Do you know what, though? They have three daughters, and we are going to make sure, when they are old enough to go to college, they will be able to inherit and use the GI bill's benefits that their father and their mother will never use.

A lot of times, we think about what the GI bill does to help servicemembers like me and like my dad, but it also helps a lot of families in ways we, maybe, never imagined. So I think we celebrate 75 years of the gift that this legislation provides to those survivors, like to the three Slutman girls, as they prepare to face the world without their father.

In closing, I am proud to join families across our country today in celebration of the importance of the GI bill over the last three-quarters of a century. It has enabled hundreds of thousands of veterans, including, as I said earlier, my dad and me, to pursue our dreams and to, hopefully, contribute in some way to our Nation and to our economy. This week, we reaffirm our commitment to making sure that all veterans today have similar experiences—maybe even better experiences—than we had and that they get the most out of their hard-earned GI bill benefits.

I ask all of my colleagues to join us today, here in this Chamber and across the country, in wishing the GI bill a happy 75th birthday. Here is to another 75 years of improving the lives of our Nation's veterans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

TRIBUTE TO BILLY PAYNE

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise to do something I rarely do. To start, I want to talk about a very special Georgian and a good friend of mine—a man by the name of Billy Payne. Billy is a husband, a father, a grandfather, a great Georgian, and, yes, a great American. Recently, he was one of five individuals to be inducted into the 2019 World Golf Hall of Fame. It is quite an honor. Billy Payne is a riveting storyteller, a creative thinker, and an effective leader.

Golf Magazine once wrote: ''Wherever he goes, Payne is the most interesting person in the room.''

Billy was born in Athens, GA, and he went on to play football for his hometown team, the Georgia Bulldogs. He earned a law degree from the University of Georgia and went on to open a small practice in Atlanta.

After helping to raise money for a new sanctuary at their church, Billy and Martha, his wife, were inspired and started looking for ways to make a difference in their community. The day after the new sanctuary was dedicated, Billy Payne came home from work and said to Martha: I've got it—we're going to bring the Olympics to Atlanta. Billy was undaunted by the magnitude of this decision.

He didn't have many connections at the time, but he called up city and State officials and formed a team to make a bid to host the 1996 Olympic Games. Billy spent the next 3½ years personally traveling to 110 countries to convince Olympic officials to bring the games to the city of Atlanta. On September 18, 1990, Atlanta won the bid for the 1996 Olympics all because of Billy Payne's leadership and his vision for the city.

The 1996 Olympics put Atlanta on the world map. It transformed the city and allowed us to build infrastructure that later helped Georgia to become the No. 1 State in the country in which to do business. To this very day, my alma mater, Georgia Tech, actually uses dormitories that were built to house the athletes in the 1996 Olympics in Atlanta.

After serving as President and CEO of the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games, Billy was invited to join Augusta National. In a very short period of time—actually, in 2006—he was selected to be the club's chairman, which is a role he served in for 11 years. Billy oversaw the Masters Tournament and turned it into a global brand with worldwide reach. When Billy took over at Augusta National, the club's membership was all male. Under his leadership, Augusta National broke the gender barrier and allowed women to join the club for the very first time.

He also started two major amateur events—the Latin America Amateur and the Asia-Pacific Amateur. The winners of these tournaments are invited to play in the Masters each year. As a result, young people from all over the world now have a chance to actually compete in the Masters every year.

In 2014, Billy launched the Drive, Chip & Putt Championship—a junior golf competition that gives 7- to 15-year-olds the opportunity to develop their golf skills, to compete with their peers, and to earn the opportunity to actually play and compete at the Augusta National on the Sunday before the Masters. I have seen this. It is an exciting event to see these young people compete at the very home of the Masters.

Probably the greatest achievement, however, for amateur golf may have been this year's first Augusta National Women's Amateur tournament. When the final pair walked onto the 18th green arm in arm—one the winner, the other the runner-up, two women, arm in arm, cheering each other—it was a highlight in amateur sports. In my opinion, Bobby Jones, who is the hero of amateur sports in America, was in Heaven and probably stood up and cheered.

Finally, Billy had a hand in naming his alma mater's football field, Sanford Stadium, after his coach at the University of Georgia, Vince Dooley. Last month, the university's athletic board approved the name change, and now the field is officially known as Dooley Field at Sanford Stadium.

I would be remiss if I didn't say ''Go Dogs'' this morning.

Clearly, Billy Payne's impact on Georgia and the entire country is hard to measure, but I want to tell you a story that really tells the true heart of this leader from our State.

After he announced his retirement from being the chairman of Augusta National, he was at a private dinner and was asked by no less than Bret Baier what he was going to miss the most. Without hesitation, Billy said, ''The people.'' Well, those of us at the table thought he might have been talking about the members, but he wasn't. He was talking about the employees at Augusta National. Its employees have been there for their entire careers, and they adore this man because he loves them. He treated them right, and he built their careers there.

His tenacious spirit, his love for humankind, and his steadfast leadership serve as an inspiration to us all. I thank Billy Payne for his lifetime of service to the State of Georgia and to the United States, and I congratulate him, his wife, and their kids on this induction into the World Golf Hall of Fame.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, on another topic, there is a growing crisis at our southern border, and we are told, next week, we are actually going to vote on an appropriations package for humanitarian aid at the southern border.

Recently, I and a colleague of mine, Senator STEVE DAINES of Montana, traveled down to the McAllen sector of the border in Texas. We went out on patrol overnight with the Customs and Border Patrol agents—we were out all night with them—and then went on patrol in the early morning hours just as dawn broke on the river. We saw firsthand that we don't have just an illegal immigration problem—we have a national security crisis right there at our southern border.

My biggest takeaway was that the drug trafficking down there has now risen to being a full-blown crisis. Between fiscal year 1997 and fiscal year 2018, the CBP saw a 22-percent increase in heroin, a 38-percent increase in meth, and a 73-percent increase in fentanyl seizures. In that year alone, fiscal year 2018, enough fentanyl was brought into the country illegally to kill every woman, man, and child in America. The Border Patrol agents we

spoke to estimated that they are only able to interdict between 7 and 10 percent, however, of the drugs that actually cross the border in the McAllen sector. That is a crisis. If for no other reason, we have a crisis.

In addition, the amount of human trafficking we are seeing at the border is unprecedented. Last month alone, 144,000 individuals were apprehended at our southern border. This is the highest number of apprehensions in over 13 years.

In just the first 8 months of the fiscal year, 411,000 unaccompanied children and family units were apprehended at our southern border, including 84,000 family units and 11,000 unaccompanied children, just last month—11,000 unaccompanied children. How does an unaccompanied child get all the way from Honduras or Guatemala to our border?

This is a conspiracy led by the cartels. I have seen it firsthand. We heard the gunfire across the river the night we were on patrol. It is real.

If this trend continues, 800,000 children and families could be apprehended at the southern border by the end of this fiscal year alone. To put that in perspective, we issue 1.1 million legal green cards a year that are a pathway to citizenship. This year alone, just the family units alone could be 800,000 people apprehended at the southern border. Clearly, our Border Patrol agents are overwhelmed.

When an unaccompanied child arrives at the border, they are cared for by Border Patrol agents until they can be placed in the care of the Department of Health and Human Services. However, the number of children arriving today greatly exceeds HHS's capacity to deal with them.

As of last week, 1,900 unaccompanied children were in CBP custody awaiting placement in HHS's care. But Health and Human Services had less than 700 beds in which to place them.

Now, according to the Department of Homeland Security, Border Patrol agents are spending more than half of their time caring for families and children, providing medical assistance, driving buses, and acting as food service workers instead of performing law enforcement duties.

Pulling Border Patrol agents away from their law enforcement duties only exacerbates the crisis at the border. We saw that firsthand on our overnight patrols.

The Acting Commissioner of CBP said recently: ''We are in a full-blown emergency, and I cannot say this any stronger: the system is broken.''

On May 1, the Trump administration requested $4.5 billion in funds to help address the growing crisis at the border. At the time, we were debating disaster relief for my home State of Georgia and a dozen other States across the country.

On May 23, President Trump broke the logjam and agreed to separate border humanitarian aid from the disaster relief question and it allowed us, then, within hours on this floor, to pass the disaster relief bill. Now we have to do the same thing for this humanitarian aid to the border.

Meanwhile, the humanitarian crisis at the southern border has only continued to escalate, and we have to do something about it right now.

This week, Health and Human Services and the Department of Homeland Security sent a letter to every Member of Congress. It said: ''Absent an emergency appropriation, we anticipate running out of funding as soon as later this month.''

The Department of Homeland Security has already started pulling resources away from critical missions in order to try and keep up with this surge of human traffic. Without additional funds by August, the Department of Homeland Security says they will have to redirect manpower and funding from TSA, FEMA, and the Coast Guard in order to address the crisis at the border.

The Acting Director of ICE just recently said: ''We are begging. We are asking Congress to please help us.''

This should not be a political issue. I am hoping that it will not be. This is about giving Federal agents the resources they need to care for children and families in their custody and respond to this crisis situation.

Even the New York Times editorial board said this: ''Congress, give Trump his border money.'' That is the New York Times, not a big fan of our President.

The Senate will vote on this emergency funding next week, and I hope it will receive bipartisan support. It absolutely should. Going forward, we have to address the underlying cause of this crisis, however.

Since 2014, the number of unaccompanied children and family units arriving at the southern border has skyrocketed because of loopholes in our asylum and immigration laws. Minors and family units can easily assert broad and unspecific asylum claims. Then, they are released into the United States while they await formal removal proceedings, which could be months or years down the road.

These loopholes, combined with programs like the DACA Program, have led to a staggering increase in the number of unaccompanied children and family units arriving at our border.

Oftentimes, these kids and families are exploited by cartels on their journey to the United States and are in dire need of human services by the time they get here. It is truly heartbreaking what some of these people go through. These cartels profit off the most vulnerable. They fuel the drug trade and endanger communities across our country—indeed, the world, for that matter. We have to put the cartels out of business. We have to close these loopholes that encourage illegal immigration into our country.

Finally, we have to give the Border Patrol officers the tools they need to do their jobs and protect our country. This means more technology, more personnel, and more barriers.

In conclusion, I want to say thank you to the women and men who protect our border. Their job isn't easy, but I will say this today: The best—and I mean the very best—are in our military uniforms around the world and doing our business, they are our Border Patrol people, who are protecting our border every day and night on our southern border here in the United States. We appreciate what you all do. God bless you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CUYAHOGA RIVER BURNING

Mr. BROWN. Fifty years ago this Saturday, in Cleveland, OH, about 7 miles from where my wife and I now live, sparks from a railcar traveling over the Cuyahoga River near Lake Erie ignited debris in the water below, lighting our river on fire for what would be the last time. It wasn't the first time the river had burned. It wasn't the biggest fire ever on the river, but it surely had the most impact.

Soon after that fire, Time magazine published a story calling the Cuyahoga River one of the worst rivers in the country. It was hard even for us who live in Ohio to argue otherwise.

I remember how polluted the river was and the lake was when I was growing up. Even to a child, it was obvious that most of what was in the river didn't belong in that river. Industry used the river as an open sewer, and oil coated the Cuyahoga River.

We knew that for generations Ohio's industry powered our country, making the steel that won our wars, built our skyscrapers, and went into the cars and trucks that carried our products and workers around the country. But our river—the Cuyahoga River—paid the price.

The city's own wastewater system was outdated and ill-equipped for what was then America's tenth largest city. Americans were horrified by the scenes of that burning river. It was a wake-up call to people all over our great country that industrial pollution had real costs.

People were becoming more and more aware of the scope of our environmental problems—polluted air, dirty rivers and lakes, oil spills off our coasts.

Citizens woke up. Citizens demanded that their government take action. Our mayor in Cleveland, Carl Stokes, helped to lead the charge, pressing this Congress for Federal help.

Congress passed the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act. Congress created the Environmental Protection Agency. The country celebrated the first Earth Day, and we made real progress.

The city of Cleveland, the State of Ohio, and citizen activists transformed

the Cuyahoga River Valley. Representatives Ralph Regula, a Republican, and John Seiberling, a Democrat, led efforts to create the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, which later became the Cuyahoga Valley National Park.

Think of that. There aren't that many national parks east of the Mississippi River—a national park in the Cuyahoga River Valley.

Today our river is home to more than 60 species of fish. Families canoe and kayak and fish. The industrial river valley in downtown Cleveland, what we call the Flats, has been transformed into a center for recreation entertainment.

NPR this week said that the cleanup ''has been such a success that environmental officials travel from around the world to take notes.''

All the cleanup we have done has not hurt our economy—far from it. We know the talking points. We hear from lobbyists in this building. We know the talking points we hear from corporations. They say that environmental protections hurt businesses and kill jobs.

The Cuyahoga proves them 180 degrees wrong. The river transports millions of tons of materials to and from local industries and supports 15,000 jobs. It produces $1.7 billion in economic activity.

For all that progress, more needs to be done. Last week, I was on the shores of Lake Erie and held a roundtable with Ohioans who love this lake. They told me they are worried that after 50 years of progress on the Cuyahoga and across Lake Erie, the shallowest and most vulnerable of the Great Lakes, we are at risk of going backward. The lake is threatened by harmful algal blooms and by climate change. I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for being the most important Member of this Senate talking about that issue every day, every day, every day. The lake is threatened by invasive species, and it is threatened by emerging contaminants that are in our drinking water.

Unfortunately, we have a President and an administration that deny climate science and that yesterday, again, with their announcement, want to give polluters free rein.

The President has tried every year to gut the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, which keeps our five Great Lakes clean. Every single year the President has tried to do that. His EPA proposes leaving thousands of miles of waterways unprotected. They have abandoned the Paris Agreement—the best blueprint we have to combat climate change.

Having watched for 50 years, first as a young child, then, having seen what has happened, having watched for 50 years the cleanup of this great lake and the waterways in my State, which is still an industrial State and still an agriculture State, I know we can't go back. We can't let our country return to the days when our rivers flowed with trash, sewage, and industrial waste, and our air and water made our children sick.

We can't ignore climate change, one of the great moral issues of our time.

Let's honor this 50th anniversary by committing ourselves to trusting our scientists, protecting our lakes and rivers, taking action to preserve our country for our children and our grandchildren before it is too late.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is my great honor to join Senator BROWN of Ohio here on this 50th anniversary.

The image of a river aflame is engraved in our collective memory. For Ohioans, for Senator BROWN, and for all others who care about our water and environment, the Cuyahoga River remains a rallying cry.

Time magazine ran a piece in 1969 calling it this: ''Chocolate brown, oily, bubbling with subsurface gasses, it oozes rather than flows.''

No fish lived in it. It was too dangerous for drinking or swimming.

''The lower Cuyahoga has no visual signs of life, not even low forms such as leeches and sludge worms that usually thrive on wastes,'' a Federal report said.

Virginia Aveni, captain of a vessel charged with cleaning up, told the Plain Dealer that the river ''was a complete gel almost of petrochemicals.'' There was a ''sheen and thickness of the river . . . . it was totally jammed with downfall from upstream'' and had ''every kind of litter you can imagine.''

Today, waterfowl are back, and paddlers enjoy themselves. It has been named River of the Year for 2019. Fish from the river are now safe to eat. A river that inspired a generation to act in the name of our environment has rewarded that effort.

By the time a spark jumped off a nearby passing train and lit the river on fire in 1969, it was no surprise. The river had burst into flames 13 times before between 1868 and 1969. This is the most economically damaging fire, in 1952, which cost over $1.3 million—$12 million in today's dollars.

An earlier fire in 1912 was the deadliest, killing 5 people.

What was different this time? America paid attention.

Of course the Cuyahoga was not our only polluted waterway. The Potomac River in Washington, DC, was, to describe it in Time's words ''stinking from the 240 million gallons of waste [that] were flushed into it daily,'' and ''Omaha's meatpackers [filled] the Missouri River with animal grease balls as big as oranges.''

Americans wised up to what we were doing to our planet. We grew tired of unchecked industries using our common assets as their dumps, and things changed. It produced some of the most significant environmental and public health protections in history: the December 1970 establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency, the 1972 amendments to the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, the Ocean Dumping Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Resources Conservation and Recovery Act, and the Toxic Substances Control Act. And, of course, there was the big one—the National Environmental Policy Act.

Each one had broad popular support. Each garnered bipartisan support. It is hard to imagine that today, but it happened.

The American people have made hard-earned progress protecting our waters in the last 50 years. We want to swim in our lakes. We want to fish in our rivers. We want to drink from our streams.

We do not want to go back to the days when rivers oozed, but the Trump administration has the clear aim of allowing industry donors to pollute more and faster.

The price for this is paid in our rivers, on our lands, in our oceans, and in our climate. Right now, in our atmosphere and oceans, we are approaching the kind of environmental catastrophe that befell the Cuyahoga, only magnified many times over.

Let's ensure that the Cuyahoga did not burn in vain and that the lessons of the Cuyahoga River, Love Canal, Deepwater Horizon, and other preventable disasters are not repeated by us, now on a global scale. We took bipartisan action to protect our environment before. If we can break the devil's grip on the fossil fuel industry here, we can do it again.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, on rollcall vote 176, I voted nay. It was my intention to vote yea. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to correct my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF RITA BARANWAL

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to speak in support of the nomination of Dr. Rita Baranwal to be Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy at the Department of Energy. Dr. Baranwal was reported from the Energy and Natural Resources Committee without opposition in both the 115th and 116th Congresses, and I am glad we will vote to confirm her today.

Over the past several years, the United States has lost influence in nuclear energy to countries like Russia and China. That is not a positive development, but advanced nuclear technologies have the potential to reposition the United States as a leader in the world market.

To achieve that, we will need strong, experienced, and consistent leadership at the Department of Energy. Dr.

Baranwal's experience as the director of the Gateway for Accelerated Innovation in Nuclear, also referred to as GAIN, provides her with an informed perspective to push forward the research, development, and deployment of advanced reactor technologies.

Congress began to demonstrate its strong support for advanced nuclear through the enactment of two bills in the last Congress, the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act and the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act. These new laws are intended to facilitate reactor development and streamline the licensing process at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

In addition, legislation I have sponsored, the Nuclear Energy Leadership Act, has garnered 17 bipartisan cosponsors in this new Congress. Our bill provides for the next steps on advanced nuclear technologies, including the need to ensure high-assay, low-enriched uranium fuel is available for them.

We need a strong leader in the Office of Nuclear Energy, someone who recognizes the potential of these technologies, who will move forward so that we can realize that potential and who will work to restore the United States' leadership in nuclear energy. I appreciate Dr. Baranwal's willingness to serve in this role and urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rita Baranwal, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Nuclear Energy).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 180 Ex.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Baldwin	Gardner	Peters
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Bennet	Grassley	Reed
Blackburn	Hassan	Risch
Blumenthal	Hawley	Roberts
Blunt	Heinrich	Romney
Boozman	Hirono	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shaheen
Cardin	Jones	Shelby
Carper	Kaine	Sinema
Casey	Kennedy	Smith
Collins	King	Stabenow
Coons	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Leahy	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Udall
Cruz	McSally	Van Hollen
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Murphy	Wyden
Ernst	Murray	Young
Feinstein	Paul	

NAYS—5

Cortez Masto	Rosen	Warren
Markey	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—9

Booker	Harris	Rounds
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Sanders
Gillibrand	Moran	Toomey

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 88, 90, 92, 93, 334, 195, 196, 197, and 287.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Seth Daniel Appleton, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Dino Falaschetti, of Montana, to be Director, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, for a term of six years; Robert Hunter Kurtz, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Bimal Patel, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; Allison Herren Lee, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2022; Keith Krach, of California, to be an Under Secretary of State (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment); Keith Krach, of California, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; Keith Krach, of California, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of five years; United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years; Jeffrey L. Eberhardt, of Wisconsin, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Appleton, Falaschetti, Kurtz, Patel, Lee, Krach, Krach, Krach, and Eberhardt nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session on the motion to proceed to S. 1790. I further ask that notwithstanding rule XXII, the postcloture time on S. 1790 expire at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, June 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

(The remarks of Mr. PORTMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1925 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. PORTMAN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

CLEAN POWER PLAN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, earlier this week, the Trump administration, through the EPA Administrator, Andrew Wheeler, issued what was called the Clean Power Plan rule. That replaces the Obama-era Clean Power Plan rule that dealt with carbon emissions from our powerplants. I am very

concerned about this proposed rule, and I want to share some of my concerns with the Members of the Senate and the American people.

The Obama Clean Power Plan rule was aimed at reducing carbon emissions by 30 percent by the year 2030 compared to the 2005 level. It was a strong proposal, but it gave maximum discretion to the States on how they could meet those targets. Those States that relied more on coal-burning power generation were given different standards than those States that had already transitioned to cleaner energy sources. It was a fair rule, a tough rule, and a rule that would significantly reduce carbon emissions in this country.

Powerplants are the largest single source of carbon pollution, and we know how harmful carbon pollution is to our environment. Nearly 40 percent comes from power generation.

We need strong Federal regulation. We were moving in that direction under the previous administration. Now we demote the current emissions standards to a mere suggestion. That is wrong, and I hope that does not become the case.

There are many reasons that we should be concerned about this rule. We should be concerned about what we are doing about carbon pollution. Let me cite a few.

In the area of public health, we know that if we don't control carbon emission, we will have more premature deaths. The New York Times estimates that there would be 1,400 annual premature deaths as a result of not properly regulating the carbon emissions coming from powerplants.

We also know that because of the impact carbon has on public health, the failure to regulate it means more children will miss schooldays because of their respiratory challenges and more parents won't be able to work because they have to take care of their children. So the result is lost schooldays and lost workdays because of the failure to regulate, which affects our economy and our educating workforce.

We know that children who are vulnerable to respiratory ailments, such as asthma, are particularly at risk, and there will be more days that they will be confined to some form of air-conditioning rather than being able to go out in the neighborhood.

It is also a matter of our economy. We know that clean energy produces more jobs. That is where we are headed, and the faster we get there, the better it will be for our economy.

We also know, as a matter of energy security, the faster we move in this direction, the more secure we will be. America has taken steps to wean ourselves off of imported energy, but our allies around the world are still too dependent, as we know from the way Russia uses energy as a weapon. We need to transition to renewable energy sources so there can be energy security for America's allies.

Lastly, on the environment, carbon is the major pollutant for nitrogen pollution in our waters. I say that because many of you have heard me talk frequently on the floor about the Chesapeake Bay and the importance of the Chesapeake Bay. It is a national treasure. It is the largest estuary in our hemisphere. It is critically important to the way of life here in the Chesapeake Bay watersheds—six States and the District of Columbia. We recognize its economic value—$1 trillion to our economy.

Well, 85 million pounds of nitrogen pollution goes into the Chesapeake Bay from the air. One-third of the Chesapeake Bay's total nitrogen load comes as a result of our failure to regulate carbon going into the air. This causes algae blooms in the Chesapeake Bay. It causes dead zones. It makes it much more difficult for the stakeholders to meet their stated goals.

I am proud of the Chesapeake Bay Program. All the local governments have agreed on their responsibility. It is tailored toward the States and enforced through the help of the Federal Government. But because of this rule change, it is now going to be more difficult to meet the goals we have set for the Chesapeake Bay. It is not just affecting the powerplants; it is affecting our quality of life, public health, the environment, and the economy.

The States have acted. I am proud of what Maryland has done. We have shown that you can clean up your carbon emissions through power production and you can grow your economy. We have done that in the State of Maryland. We have joined with other States in the RGGI—with Delaware, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New York—and we have shown a 40-percent reduction in emissions since 2009. That is what the States have done.

In the rule that is being proposed, they are saying they are leaving it up to the States. Maryland has done that, but we are downwind. The progress we are making is being negated by the pollution coming in from the Midwest. We need a national standard in order to be able to meet our targets.

I would urge my colleagues, let's get engaged. This rule is bad for our economy. It is bad for public health. It is bad for energy security. It is bad for the environment. We can do better. Let's work together so that we have proper regulation at the national level dealing with carbon emissions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

VA MISSION ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I wanted to join with my colleagues this week to mark the implementation of an updated and streamlined healthcare system that is specifically for our veterans. This is made possible by the VA MISSION Act.

In Tennessee, we have such a large and vigorous and wonderful population of veterans. I will tell you, we are so grateful to them for their service, and we are so grateful they have chosen to make Tennessee their retirement home.

One of our colleagues asked me one day about how patriotic Tennessee is. They had been there to visit. They saw flags out in so many places. They saw signs out that were ''thank you'' signs to our veterans. I told them that I felt like it was because we do have a strong military presence. Fort Campbell is primarily in Tennessee. We have Millington, the air naval station. We have Arnold. We have our National Guard, and a couple of our units have just finished a good deployment. We cherish these veterans, and they are such an integral part of our communities and our churches.

We have worked diligently on this healthcare system for veterans to specifically meet their needs. That should be the mission of the VA. It is not to serve itself but to serve the veterans.

Once this new structure that is put in place by the MISSION Act is fully implemented, members of the military community who have been, in my words, neglected for too long—their access to healthcare neglected—they are finally going to get the attention and the care they need. I use the term ''neglected'' because anybody who knew they were headed to the VA clinic for a checkup knew that was not going to be a quick checkup. There is a lot of paperwork that goes into that process of asking for that checkup and then seeing it actually take place.

I have heard from hundreds of veterans, their stories and their experiences. Sometimes you will hear them say it was a comedy of errors. But it is no comedy; it is a catastrophe of errors. The consequences from this have really taken a toll on the life, the health, the safety, and sometimes the sanity of our veterans community.

The reason you hear these stories is because we have asked generations of veterans to put their physical and their emotional health in the hands of practitioners whose hands were tied by arbitrary rules and procedures that turned even simple procedures into what would be a logistical nightmare. I have no doubt that if we went around this Chamber and each Member of this Chamber were to stand, they could—without any notes, right off the top of their head—give us a story they have heard from a veteran. That should never happen.

But as of this month, we have dealt with a lot of these issues. We have removed some of the roadblocks. And the new Community Care Program, which adopted elements from the successful Veterans Choice Program, will continue to allow veterans to seek care closer to home. What was once a cluster of seven programs has been merged into one single system—a whole-of-health, whole-of-the-soldier approach. It makes this process simpler and easier to understand and to implement this program.

Options will expand even more with the authorization of local provider agreements and access to walk-in community clinics, which is specifically and precisely, what for years veterans have said they want:

Just let me go to the doctor in my hometown.

We have a neighborhood clinic over here.

We have a clinic over at the pharmacy, the CVS or the Walgreens. Let me go there and not have to drive to a clinic that is out of town.

One provision in particular that I believe is going to really make a big difference is the removal of barriers that have prevented VA healthcare professionals from practicing telemedicine. Any of us who have used telemedicine and have Skyped with a physician know this is a timesaver. It gets you in front of the doctor in a more expeditious fashion. It allows you to get that advice to start taking and treating your ailment sooner. It is a huge timesaver. This is now going to be available.

As we are crafting these updates, we are careful to consider the cost to the patient and to make sure that veterans won't have to worry about receiving a massive bill if they see a provider at a local community facility. The VA MISSION Act keeps costs at these clinics in line with those at the VA healthcare centers.

We have also taken steps to encourage consistent treatment at the VA healthcare centers by providing the funds necessary for these clinics to retain top talent. You have to have healthcare professionals in the clinics in order for these clinics to see their patients.

Most importantly, the VA MISSION Act supports these changes via an updated and extensive system of reporting and accountability. For years, this body has debated the merits of various healthcare regimes for children, the elderly, and the poor, but for some reason, we have asked veterans to accept a system incapable of providing care without snarling patients in miles and miles of redtape. For this, we owe the veterans community an apology.

It is an honor to work with our veterans and now say that the VA MISSION Act is being implemented and that care is coming to your community. I think this reflects the sincere desire to do right by our best and our bravest.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, we are just a few days away from the first official Democratic Presidential debate of the campaign season in Miami, but for anyone paying close attention, the first meaningful debate is actually about only 48 hours away in South Carolina.

On Saturday, 11 Democrats, including 4 of the top 5 in the current polls, are going to take part in a candidate forum hosted by the Planned Parenthood Action Fund.

What is Planned Parenthood? Planned Parenthood is the country's largest abortion business. That is their mainstay of operation. Last year, Planned Parenthood reported committing more than 330,000 abortions—somewhere between one-third and one-half of all abortions committed in America last year. Planned Parenthood's president has said that providing, protecting, and expanding access to abortion is part of the organization's ''core mission.'' It does this work with the help of more than $500 million in annual subsidies from the Federal Government; that is, from taxpayers across this country, many of whom believe that abortion is immoral. Yet the position of Planned Parenthood is and has long been abortion at any time, anywhere, for any reason for free. That used to represent the most extreme position anywhere in the Democratic Party. It was shared by only a very small, hard-fringe portion of its elected leaders.

Just to review some history, in 2008, Hillary Clinton was still calling for safe, legal, and rare abortion access, and as she would regularly emphasize, ''by rare, I mean rare.'' Yet, today, the radical things that the Nation's largest abortion business wants are basically indistinguishable from the position of every Democrat who is now running for President—abortion at any time, anywhere, for any reason for free.

In fact, it is actually worse than this because the position of every Senator who is currently running for the Democratic nomination and of at least one Governor is that a living, breathing baby who survives an abortion procedure can still be left to die after birth. All seven Senators who are currently running for the Democratic Presidential nomination voted against the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act earlier this year, and Governor Bullock of Montana vetoed a State-level version of that bill just before he entered the race.

As things currently stand, it is entirely possible that the next Democratic nominee for the highest office in our land will be publicly agnostic about the moral status of post-abortion infanticide—morally agnostic about post-abortion infanticide.

Let's be clear. These candidates are wildly and spectacularly out of the mainstream in American life. Over the last two decades, Gallup polling has consistently shown that a majority of Americans are opposed to unrestricted abortion access beyond the first trimester. The Gallup numbers actually show that well under one-third of Americans support abortion beyond the first 3 months, and a new NBC/PBS/Marist poll finds that fully four out of five Americans are opposed to all abortion in the third trimester. That includes a majority of self-identifying pro-choice voters. I want to say that again. A majority of self-identified pro-choice voters in America are opposed to abortion in the third trimester. So the polling of Americans is actually quite different than what the Democrats are going to pretend it to be over the next 2 days when they talk into their echo chamber.

What is even more important than anything about public opinion is that the Democrats are also out of step with our fundamental American conviction that all men are created equal—all men and women and babies. Instead, they are increasingly committed to the proposition that some people are less than human and are, therefore, disposable. Sadly, though, the most radical leftwing voices are winning in their party's echo chamber, and Democratic candidates have now decided that they must prostrate themselves before the ''flush with cash'' abortion industry. This has consequences well beyond policy. As Democrats' abortion positions have become more extreme, they have no longer sought to even persuade fellow citizens with whom they disagree. Rather, they have become openly hostile to Americans who disagree on this great moral challenge.

My colleague from New York, for instance, Senator GILLIBRAND, who will be attending this weekend's forum in South Carolina, made her feelings clear earlier this month in an interview with the Des Moines Register. In promising that she would appoint only judges who would uphold Roe v. Wade, here is what she said. Listen to this quote:

> I think there [are] some issues that have such moral clarity that we have as a society decided that the other side is not acceptable.
>
> Imagine saying that it's OK to appoint a judge who is racist or anti-Semitic or homophobic.
>
> [This is not an issue where] there is a fair ''other side.'' There is no moral equivalency when you come to racism, and I do not believe there is a moral equivalency when it comes to changing laws that deny women reproductive freedom.

What? What are we talking about here? Are you kidding me? Did you catch what she just said?

According to a sitting U.S. Senator and a candidate for the Democratic nomination to be President of the United States, holding pro-life views in America is no longer acceptable. It is not a fair position, she tells us. It is the moral equivalency of racism or anti-Semitism. Perhaps in the Senator's next interview she will suggest that pro-life Americans belong in a basket of deplorables.

There is so much wrong with this statement that it is difficult to know where to begin. We could note the plain, simple fact that it is not prolifers who have an ugly link to racism. Rather, since the very beginning, the American abortion industry has been intimately connected to eugenics. This is the origin of the movement.

As Planned Parenthood founder Margaret Sanger put it herself—and think about this quote—''the unbalance between the birth rate of the 'unfit' and

the 'fit' [is] the greatest present menace to civilization.''

Sanger's racial opinions are a matter of some dispute, but this part is clear—that she intentionally targeted efforts at Black neighborhoods in Harlem and in the Deep South. Many of the people involved in her efforts took things a step further—going so far as to forcibly sterilize African-American women whom they deemed to be unfit to procreate.

We can also note that it is, in part, because of this ugly history that, today, Black women in America are 3½ times more likely to have abortions than White women, and in some parts of Senator GILLIBRAND's home State, Black children are actually more likely to be aborted than to be carried to term.

We could also point to the continued eugenic use of abortion—for example, to kill children who have nonlife-threatening diseases. In the United States today, two-thirds of all babies in the womb who are found to have Down syndrome are aborted, and in some parts of Europe, the rate is pushing 100 percent. There are public ad campaigns in two nations in Europe that celebrate the fact that they have gotten rid of all of their Down syndrome babies.

Instead of going point by point, I will just recommend that anyone who wants to better understand this disturbing history read Justice Clarence Thomas's concurring opinion last month in Box v. Planned Parenthood of Indiana and Kentucky. Yet, according to my Senate colleague, perhaps Justice Thomas is one of those racists—you know, one of those notorious pro-life racists who is stalking America.

In their leftward lurch to become the Planned Parenthood candidate, it is not just that the Democrats who seek this office are losing touch with where Americans actually are on the hard questions of abortion or with our fundamental American convictions, it is also, as my colleague from the State of New York has shown, that we are losing touch with even how to do politics like Americans, where you respect the dignity of people you differ with and argue about the ideas. You don't declare them an unfit and an unworthy, unacceptable other side. Americans have always had a genius for talking to each other. In our constitutional system, we set up debate fora like this to be able to facilitate, channel, and elevate debate—even heated, feverish debate about really sensitive topics.

Our Framers held firmly to the principle that men and women in their exercise of reason could come to agreements by persuasion and by dialogue even if it took a long time and even if the topics were difficult. Anything less than that would be a violation of the basic dignity of our fellow citizens. Our Founders knew that hard political issues should not be resolved at gunpoint; they should be resolved by debate, which starts by assuming the dignity of your counterparty in that debate.

We are watching that conviction go by the wayside right now. Slandering pro-life Americans as being, in effect, Klan members and Nazis is just a way to crush debate, not to persuade. It is a way of saying that these people—people like my mom, who prays outside abortion clinics; people like my daughters and my wife, who have spent a lot of hours volunteering at crisis pregnancy centers; and people like the overwhelming majority of Nebraskans, whom I get to represent, or Indianans, whom the Presiding Officer now gets to represent—are so morally repugnant that they don't deserve a voice, that they don't deserve to be treated like human beings, that they don't deserve to be engaged in debate, that they are not people you could possibly have a reasonable conversation with.

This is crazy talk.

It is not difficult to imagine where this approach leads. When we lose sight of the intrinsic and inexhaustible dignity of unborn children, we open the door to abortion's violence, and when we lose sight of the dignity of our fellow citizens in debate, we open the door to yet other kinds of violence.

I have spent a lot of time with prolifers in my life, probably a lot more time than most of my colleagues who are going to be at the Planned Parenthood debate in South Carolina on Saturday. I will tell you what you will not find among these people is partisan caricature. What you will find are people who are passionately devoted to the dignity of every human being no matter how small or how vulnerable or what disease one might have been diagnosed with. You will find a lot of Americans, young and old, in the pro-life movement who care deeply about women who are in need. You will also find a lot of enthusiasm for promising in vitro surgeries and for scientific developments in ultrasound and neonatal technology. You will find fellow citizens who are ready to advance the basic American commitment to life through the tools of dialogue, persuasion, and respect.

The dehumanization of our friends and neighbors, whether they are in the opposite party or in the womb, destroys our national life together and our national conversation. On both sides, we need to be constantly stitching back together that fabric that has been torn asunder.

I suggest to the Democrats who are heading to the South Carolina debate this weekend to spend less time wrestling with each other in order to say more ridiculously extreme, clickbait things for high-propensity primary voters and spend more time listening to the voices of their pro-life fellow citizens. My guess is they will learn something, and our national debate will be the better for it.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The Senator from Oregon.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, Ernest Hemingway said that the world is a fine place and worth fighting for, and I couldn't agree more. My colleague from Delaware and I are here on the floor to fight for that world, to fight for our planet.

If you breathe in a lung full of air right now—and I invite anybody following this to do so—hold it for a few seconds, and breathe it out, the air that you will have just taken into your body, into your lungs, will have had 33 percent more carbon than when I was born. That is a dramatic transformation of the atmosphere on this planet. It doesn't matter where you go. You could be doing this exercise here in DC, back home in Oregon, or in Japan. It is still 33 percent more carbon in a single lifetime. Because that extra carbon is blanketing our entire globe, it is having a huge impact—an impact we see in all kinds of ways.

Back home in Oregon, there has been a huge impact with the forest fires. We had forest fires this year that started in March. Perhaps you have seen some pictures of walls of flames and fires in Montana, in Washington, in Oregon, and in California in the last couple of years—smoke that has blanketed our cities and our States for weeks on end.

This is not the norm. This is the result of changing climate chaos, and it is not good.

We see extreme weather across the country. We see more powerful hurricanes assaulting the Southeast. We see more Lyme disease in the Northeast and fewer moose because the ticks kill the moose and ticks carry Lyme disease to humans. We see the slowest planting season in four decades—too much rain, flooded farms.

As of June 3, the Department of Agriculture told us 40 million acres of corn that would normally have been planted haven't been planted.

Climate chaos is the greatest threat humans have ever seen on this planet, and it is happening for one simple reason: We discovered fossil fuels. We discovered that burning them could create a lot of energy, and we could transform the globe with that energy, but every single time you use those carbon sources, you put carbon in the air, and now we have started to really damage our own planet.

So what is the national response? Well, under President Obama, we had the Clean Power Plan—the CPP. The CPP laid out a pretty ambitious vision, an example for the world to follow, but, quite frankly, it wasn't enough. It doesn't accelerate enough our transition to renewable energy.

Just think about it this way: We have been gifted with a fabulous source of fusion energy. We don't have to recreate fusion reactors here on the planet because we have it safely stowed millions of miles away in the Sun. That is a fusion reactor. All we have to do is capture the energy that shines on planet Earth, and we are in pretty good

shape. That Sun heats up the air and creates wind, and we can capture that same energy by capturing the wind.

We have geothermal energy, potential wave energy. We have to transition to these sources and quit burning carbon, and we need an ambitious plan to do so. We need a turning point.

Future generations will either celebrate the moment when we committed ourselves to saving our planet or they will ask why we failed, and right now we are looking at failure. The rate of carbon pollution isn't going down; it is accelerating upward. We are accelerating into oblivion.

When I was born, it took about 2 to 3 years to increase a single point of carbon pollution, parts per million. You can see how this curve is now accelerating upward. Now we are at about 2.5 points per year. That is a huge difference.

We are kind of lulled into this false sense of comfort. Well, don't we have more insulation in our buildings? Aren't we blessed with cars that get greater mileage? We have appliances that use a little less energy. Well, yes, those things are true, but they are not enough. Even with that, the curve is accelerating upward. So we are in trouble, but we do have some blessings in this battle.

Solar and wind electricity have plunged in cost, and the result is they are now cheaper than or competitive with fossil fuels. That is before you take into account the massive subsidies granted by legislative action to fossil fuels. So they are actually cheaper, and that is before you take into account the externalities—the damage that fossil fuels are doing to our planet. So now we can really see that renewables are a complete win except for the greed manifested through our political campaigns to keep burning fossil fuels.

It means more dollars in a few corporations' pockets, pockets of a few really rich people who say that their generational need for wealth—which they can't take with them to the grave anyway—that generational need, they are willing to sacrifice our planet for all.

Now, they are not willing to bear the costs. They are not willing to pay for the damage to all the homes destroyed by those more powerful hurricanes. They are not willing to pay for all the forests destroyed by the forest fires in Oregon. They are not willing to pay for the structures destroyed by those fires. They are not willing to pay the farmers whose crop is going to produce less because they had to plant so late. In other words, they want the private profit while planet Earth and the rest of us bear the consequences of their greed.

So we need a strong plan, and we need it now. We need to have a clear, robust response to transition to renewable energy quickly. So let's build on the foundation of the Clean Power Plan. Let's make this the turning moment in history that future generations can celebrate because we really do have a very fine planet, and it is worth fighting for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. While the Senator from Oregon is here, I just want to say he mentioned we have a very fine planet, and God knows we do, but it is also the only planet we have, and I think for certainly everybody who serves in this body—and maybe some of these young pages will have the opportunity someday to live on another planet but probably not.

The President of France was just down the hall 2 years ago. I am sure Senator MERKLEY remembers it. President Macron addressed us on a variety of subjects, but one of those was the future of our plant.

He said these words. I will never forget them. He said: We only get one planet, planet Earth. There is no planet B. This is it.

He reminded us of our obligation, really a moral obligation, to take care of this gift from God that he has entrusted into our care.

It is in that spirit that I am pleased to rise today with Senator MERKLEY and other colleagues to speak out against the so-called Affordable Clean Energy rule that repeals and replaces the Clean Power Plan from the previous administration.

As I said when this rule was proposed in, I think, August of last year—and our colleague, given where he is from in America, maybe they say this in his State too—but we have a saying here that you can put lipstick on a pig, but it is still a pig.

I said at the time when this rule was introduced that the only thing that has changed from the proposal to the final rule is maybe a little more lipstick.

The Trump EPA rule promotes neither affordable energy nor clean energy. What it actually does is it attempts to scam the American people into believing that the EPA is doing something to stem the tide of climate change.

I think this poster probably speaks well to that thought, but this proposal, I think, is a failure of vision, and I think it is an abdication of leadership in our fight against climate change. We need to fight this problem head-on.

The fact that our climate is warming, the fact that we have this extreme weather, whether it happens to be in the Midwest with floods, the Northwest with wildfires the size of my State, whether it happens to be in the number of category 5 hurricanes that we are seeing, extreme weather—literally within an hour or so of here, Ellicott City, where they have had two 1,000-year floods in 18 months.

My wife and I were out in Palo Alto, CA, last weekend for the graduation of our oldest son from business school, and the week before we arrived there, he told us that the temperature in the Bay Area, where I used to be stationed in the Navy during the Vietnam war, he said that the temperature reached 104 degrees. I don't ever remember it ever reaching 94 degrees in the years I was stationed in Moffett Field Naval Air Station.

Something is going on here, and it is serious. I think we have a pretty good idea what is causing this, and we need to fight this challenge head-on.

The good news is this doesn't have to be something to divide us as a nation. It doesn't have to be something that divides us as Democrats and Republicans. It doesn't have to be something that divides us with respect to the rest of the world. This is something that should unite us.

There is an old saying that the enemy of my enemy is my friend. Well, the enemy of a world that has all this crazy weather, extreme weather—and maybe in a lot of places in the internal part of our country you don't see what we see. What we see is that my State is sinking. Delaware is the lowest lying State in America. We are sinking, and the seas around us are rising. That is not a very good combination.

Folks who don't happen to live on our coast—I was born in West Virginia, grew up in other parts of the country, but for us it is real. It is not just something that is esoteric. We see it every day.

The science behind climate change is, I believe, settled. Climate change is real. It is happening. It is a growing threat to our country, and it is getting worse every year.

Climate change is leading to rising global temperatures, rising sea levels, more frequent and severe weather events such as hurricanes, rainfall measured by the foot, not by the inch, and drought-fueled wildfires, as I said earlier, the size of my State.

The more I hear about these extreme weather events, the more I am reminded of the story in the Old Testament. I think it is in the book of Exodus, where you may recall that Moses gets a call from on high to lead the people of Israel out of Egypt where they are in bondage.

He tells God: God, I am not a very good public speaker, and I don't think you have the right guy to do this.

The Lord said to him: You have a brother, Aaron, who is a real good speaker, a real good talker. Why don't the two of you sort of lead this effort together?

So, urged by the Almighty, the two brothers visited the pharaoh who was running the show in Egypt. They called on him and said: We are here to ask you to let our people go. Set us free.

Pharaoh was stubborn. He rejected their plea, and there were consequences to that rejection. I think there were about 10 different plagues that were brought to bear on Egypt in an effort to try to convince the pharaoh to let the people go, like the hordes of locusts that covered the land.

Moses and Aaron would go back to see the pharaoh and would say: We

want you to let our people go. The pharaoh would say, basically: Get out of here.

Then, after that, snakes would come out and appear everywhere, all over the land.

They would go back and see the pharaoh, and he would say: Get out of here.

Lizards came out of the rivers and covered the land, and they went back to see the pharaoh, and he said: Get out of here.

Finally, the river was turned to blood, and they went back to see him, and he said: Get out of here.

Finally, after the 10th plague, he changed his tune. The 10th plague, as you may recall, if you remember the Old Testament—the 10th plague was the firstborn sons of every Egyptian family died.

That time when Moses and Aaron showed up to see the pharaoh, he said: Why don't you leave. Take all your people and your stuff and just leave, and they left—and they left.

Our President's dismissal of the extreme weather that is associated with the unrelenting worsening reality of climate change reminds me of the pharaoh's dismissal of the plagues unleashed on the people of Israel 2,000 years ago.

The pharaoh was dismissive. This President is dismissive. We have seen this movie before. In this movie version of it, our President is playing the role of pharaoh, and we need to make sure we don't succumb to that.

The Obama-Biden administration finalized the Clean Power Plan to reduce carbon pollution and try to stem the tide of climate change.

The Clean Power Plan established the very first Federal targets to reduce carbon emissions from our Nation's electric powerplants, which at the time were the largest source of carbon pollution in our country not that long ago.

The rule was not developed on a whim. The Clean Power Plan was finalized after a lengthy rulemaking process, which was 2 years or longer in the making. They considered over 3.5 million public comments, and I am told they responded to every one of them.

The Clean Power Plan set real carbon reduction targets for each State but gave flexibility and time for States to meet these individualized standards. EPA estimated the Clean Power Plan would have achieved over $54 billion—that is billion with a ''b''—in health and climate benefits if fully implemented. The Clean Power Plan provided long-term certainty for U.S. businesses, helping American companies make smart investments at home and compete in the global energy market around the world.

When finalized, critics of the Clean Power Plan—and there were plenty of them—argued the plan's carbon targets were too ambitious. That is only about 4 or 5 years ago. Critics swore that every American consumer who relies on electricity to keep the lights on would soon be in dire straits. Administrator Wheeler echoed these false claims just yesterday. Today, we know just how wrong the Clean Power Plan critics were.

Even though the Clean Power Plan was never fully implemented, States and utilities went ahead and started making investments in order to meet the plan's carbon standards. They began acting in a way that said: We believe this is the way we are actually going to go as a country, and we need to get onboard.

As with other clean air regulations, America's utilities have been able to find ways to meet the carbon reduction targets faster and much cheaper than originally estimated. When George Herbert Walker Bush was President, he pushed for a cap-and-trade approach to reducing acid rain in the northeastern part of our country. It was killing all of our forests, and he came up with a plan to reduce acid rain cap and trade. People said: It is going to cost too much; it is going to take too long. At the end of the day, it cost less than half of what it was supposed to cost, and I think it was accomplished in about one-third of the time.

Today, our Nation's utilities are already on track to meet and surpass the goals set by the Clean Power Plan way ahead of schedule—not on schedule but way ahead of schedule—because even though the Clean Power Plan was held up in court, it sent clear signals to the utility industry of this country.

All the while, the vast majority of Americans are now enjoying lower utilities—let me say that again. They are enjoying lower utility bills, not higher, and more than 3 million Americans are now going to work in the clean energy sector every day, which includes jobs in renewable energy generation and energy efficiency.

Despite the revolutionary changes in our energy sector, leading climate scientists are now telling us that we need to do even more to protect American lives and our economy from the threats of climate change.

In the past year alone, the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued an alarming report that concluded that if the global community does not enact ''rapid and far-reaching'' carbon reduction policies in the next decade, we could face irreversible damage to our planet as soon as 2040.

Just 6 months ago, 13 Federal agencies under the Trump administration concluded unanimously that if this country does not take more drastic actions to address climate change, every major sector of our economy could be negatively affected by climate change by the turn of the century—every one. Some sectors are expected to see hundreds of billions of dollars of loss every year. My recollection is, in the last year alone, we have suffered damages from extreme weather in our country that add up to hundreds of billions of dollars in 1 year alone.

What a science-based agency like EPA should be doing is building off of Obama's forward-looking carbon reduction vision and strengthening the Clean Power Plan standards, not weakening them. But even though utilities are on track to meet carbon reduction targets and scientists are warning us to keep our foot on the gas pedal, the Trump administration, sadly, is hitting the brakes.

What this EPA has done fails to heed the warnings of climate scientists by weakening the Obama-Biden carbon standards put into place almost 4 years ago. The Clean Power Plan set clear targets for States to achieve a 32-percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from the power sector by 2030. Let me say that again. The Clean Power Plan set clear targets for States to achieve an almost one-third reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from the power sector by 2030.

In comparison, the Trump proposal fails to set any real carbon emission standards for the power sector. It fails to set any real carbon emission standards for the power sector.

This new proposed rule provides States with a menu of options for making coal-fired powerplants operate more efficiently, allowing States to decide whether to make coal plants implement those options. This means States could do nothing to clean up their powerplant emissions—nothing.

Add it up, and the dirty power scam fails to drive down powerplant carbon emissions. According to EPA's own analysis, this rule is, at best, going to keep powerplant carbon emissions at status quo levels. At worst, there are credible reports that show the scam may well result in an increase in carbon emissions.

Like all climate change policies by President Trump, the dirty power scam also fails to advance the American clean energy economy. Instead, this rule tries to take our country back to a decade ago, when this country relied much more heavily on dirty coal generation. EPA Administrator Wheeler even touted the dirty power scam as a way to support more coal energy production in the United States. But ask any utility CEO or investor. America's future is not in dirty coal; it is in clean energy.

As a native of West Virginia whose family members once worked in coal mines, let me say this. There are 50,000 people who work in coal mines in this country today, and those jobs are going down. Today, there are 3 million people who work in sustainable energy and clean energy and conservation businesses, and for each of those 50,000 miners, we have an obligation to them and their families. If they lose their employment opportunities because we are moving to cleaner, carbon-free air, we have an obligation to help them in terms of transitioning and training for other jobs that are available. We have 3 million jobs today in this country that nobody showed up to do because they don't have the skills, the education, or the desire to do those jobs.

Coal miners could do a number of jobs. People who work in coal mines could build windmills. They could build solar fields. They can do all kinds of stuff. They can build clean corridors for our transportation, fueling electric-powered vehicles across the highways across America. They could build hydrogen fueling stations. They can do all kinds of stuff.

Today, our utilities are making investments that will last 40 to 60 years, if not longer. We should be providing the right market signals today for a clean energy economy tomorrow.

The dirty power scam doesn't do that. What it does is create business uncertainty for our Nation's utilities and States grappling with the effects of climate change.

To recap, if I could, the dirty power scam does three things, regrettably: It fails to heed the warnings of climate scientists; it fails to drive down power-plant carbon emissions; and it fails to advance a clean energy economy.

Referring again to the failure of vision and leadership, that is why the dirty power scam is a failure of vision and an abdication of leadership in our fight against climate change. Repealing the Clean Power Plan and replacing it with a rule as ill-conceived as the dirty power scam will have serious consequences for the health of the public, our economy, and our planet. It is also a clear retreat from the EPA's responsibility to tackle the greatest environmental crises we face on our planet today, and those are climate change and the extreme weather that flows from it.

The people of this country deserve a strong economy. They deserve more job creation. They deserve cleaner air. They deserve better environmental quality. The American people and our neighbors around the world deserve a healthy planet that we can call home. The American people deserve better than the dirty power scam, plain and simple.

My colleagues and I are going to do everything in our power to make sure that the people of this country ultimately get the climate protection they deserve.

The last thing I would say before yielding back to Senator MERKLEY is that the issue of climate change is not something that should divide us. Ultimately, this is something that should unite us, not just within this body, not just within this country, but around the world. That is my hope and prayer because, at the end of the day, we can clean our air, we can clean our water, we can combat climate change, and we can create a lot of jobs—a lot more than the 3 million jobs we have already seen created.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, each year we have a debate on the National Defense Authorization Act. In the past, it was a real debate—a debate for which people brought significant issues to the floor related to American national security. Their amendments were considered. We argued pro and con. We took votes. We lobbied our colleagues within our caucus or across the aisle with the wisdom of our viewpoint. That is a tradition; that is a practice; that is what this Chamber is all about—to take on the issues that we face as a Nation, wrestle with them, explore the pros and cons, find their strengths or weaknesses, sometimes come to compromises that take several viewpoints, and merge them together into an even stronger point of view. But I am deeply disturbed that the U.S. Senate is quickly losing the ability to consider the issues facing our Nation.

My colleague just spoke about the challenge of climate pollution, and I appreciate his doing so. But we have had few determined efforts to address the ideas different Members have for taking on that challenge, despite its devastation to so many ways and different parts of our country.

When it comes to the security of our country, no issue is more important than the question of going to war. Our Founders realized this is a decision that should never be vested in a single person, not even the President. They knew that a single individual might find political cause or corrupt purposes to make the decision to go to combat against a force and that such a decision should be debated in a Chamber like this and a Chamber like the House. That is why the Constitution gives to this body, the legislature of the United States of America, the power to go to war.

It is a question that came up early in our history. There was a challenge that we had off the Barbary Coast with corsairs, who are often referred to as pirates, taking charge of American brigs and holding them hostage.

Jefferson embraced the idea of going to war. He became President in 1801. Alexander Hamilton wanted to remind him what the Constitution said. As he said, ''It belongs to Congress only to go to war.'' Any one of us should be able to pull out our pocket Constitutions, read article I, section 8—that deliberate delegation to this Chamber and the House to make that decision.

Well, right now we are in the drumbeat of war with Iran. There has been a lot of animosity between our two countries for a long period of time. The United States mounted a campaign through the Central Intelligence Agency to take out the directly elected leadership of Iran in 1953—a CIA-staged coup—and to install a leader, the Shah of Iran, who operated with great, shall I say, violence against the people. He had a secret police that was as feared as any in the world.

There were other points of animosity when the people of Iran rose up against that Shah and took hostage Americans. They kept them hostage for a great length of time during the Carter administration. They did not release them until President Reagan came into office.

Then there was the Iraq-Iran war, a war in which hundreds of thousands of people in Iran died, and the United States assisted the Iraqis in that war against Iran. Well, we have had often no love lost between our two nations over this period of time.

I mention these few points of history to say that each side nurtures its grievances against the other, but something remarkable happened under the last administration. They worked to coordinate pressure from the entire world to strike a deal with Iran, to end their nuclear program, end the risk of Iran becoming a nuclear power. This agreement was something bought into by Russia and China, the European powers, and the United States. They did many concrete things, things that their rightwing did not like: dismantling their plutonium reactor, shipping enriched uranium out of their country, shutting down their centrifuges, allowing a massive amount of inspectors into their country to watch everything that they were doing.

In return, the deal was we would help them economically find a better standard of living. This is a moment of potential turning point in the relationship—this long animosity between the two countries—potentially a win-win, but then comes in a new administration, the Trump administration, and they don't like this possibility, this deal. The President says it is the worst deal ever struck. We, the United States, pulled out of the deal on May 8, 2018—just over a year ago. Since then, we have heard the drumbeats of war echoing on Capitol Hill.

The administration designated the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist organization and then proceeded to tighten the economic sanctions in order to pressure the economy of Iran.

So we had the end of the Uighurs, who are partners of ours, to be able to buy Iranian oil, greatly starving the economy of that nation. Then we deployed, in recent weeks, the *Abraham Lincoln* carrier strike force to the Gulf. Then we deployed a B–52 squadron to the Gulf. Then we heard the advocates in the administration saying: If anything happens with a connection with Iran, we will show them the ferocity of our forces. We will respond and show them not to mess with the United States of America.

Different officials cited different examples, but one was: If an Iranian militia in Iraq should happen to harm an American, that could be a trigger or if Iran were to disrupt the movement of oil from the Gulf, that could be a trigger.

When you deploy forces and then start looking for triggers, you can find one for war, if you want, but I stand here today to quote the Constitution of the United States of America, and that Constitution says the power of war

rests with this body—not the Oval Office.

As we have pressured Iran, we have had incidents occur that have been highlighted in recent days. Some mines were put on the side of a couple ships—blew a hole through the side, didn't sink the ships. The administration is pretty sure, they say, that Iran did this. Well, I always exercise some caution. We all remember the Iraq war. We remember that the administration then—the Bush administration—built what they said was a powerful case of weapons of mass destruction being cultivated by Saddam Hussein and the Iraq Government. We went to war on that evidence, and we were wrong.

Here we are at this moment and an administration that has predeployed forces, is squeezing the Iranian people as powerfully as possible. What happens in this situation? What is the goal? Some in the administration say the goal is negotiations. Now, let me get this straight. The United States broke the deal, strengthening the far right in Iran which said don't trust the Americans. We strengthened the Revolutionary Guard because the Revolutionary Guard did not like the deal to begin with. Then we economically squeezed the people of Iran, creating great hardship throughout the land—meaning we have moved the entire population in the direction of supporting the far right in that country.

Now, take these two things. We have strengthened not the moderates who want to see the nation on a different course but the far right. Then we have alienated much of the country and increased their support for the far right, and we have shown that when we sign a deal, we don't stand behind the deal because this administration broke the deal. How is that a foundation for negotiation? We are saying to Iran: We negotiated. You agreed, but we are breaking the deal, and now we want to negotiate again.

People don't tend to want to negotiate with folks who have broken the previous deal. So we here see that we have a challenge in which we stand on the precipice of potential war.

My colleague from New Mexico has an amendment that restates the fundamentals of our Constitution, and he has teamed up with my colleague from Virginia who is here on the floor as well, and I am certainly completely supportive of their effort. They are saying that while we are on this bill, on security, on Defense authorization, this is a moment we should be debating whether the President has the authority to go to war, and their amendment says: No, he does not. He must follow the Constitution, and he must come to this body for authorization. That is an important message for us to send. We must not leave the debate on Defense authorization without debating the Udall-King amendment.

My colleagues are here to speak to it in greater detail. I so much appreciate their work. This is a moment that this Chamber must rise to the challenge of being a force that can wrestle with great issues before us, and there is no more important security issue at this moment than debating whether the President has the power to go to war. I stand with the Constitution. I hope my colleagues will all stand with the Constitution in this Chamber. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I also rise today with my colleagues to talk about the rumors of war we have been hearing in this body and in the news. I want to advocate for a very simple amendment whose timing is, I think, propitious as we discuss the National Defense Authorization Act. Why wouldn't we discuss what we are hearing from the White House and others? Why wouldn't we discuss the events that are happening on the ground in the Strait of Hormuz in the Middle East?

The amendment Senator UDALL has prepared that is a bipartisan amendment that is before the body—and we hope for a vote early next week—is a straightforward one. No funds would be used to prosecute a war against Iran unless this Congress has a vote to authorize it, to authorize such a war. As my colleague from Oregon mentioned, that is what the Constitution suggests, and that is the debate we should be having.

Part of the reason I feel so strongly about this is because I am a Virginian. We are the most connected State to the military mission of the United States. All States are connected and all States are Patriotic, but if you just add up the kind of per capita in Virginia—our Active Duty, our Guard, our Reserve, our DOD civilians, like the nurses who work at the Fort Belvoir Hospital, the DOD contractors like the shipbuilders in Newport News, our military families—we are the most connected to the Nation's military mission. I am personally connected to this with a son in the U.S. Marines. So as a Virginian I feel very strongly about this, and I also feel strongly about it because we are proud of the Virginians, Madison, Jefferson, and others, who are among the Founders who crafted the Constitution. They tried to do some things that were pretty revolutionary then, and they are still revolutionary. Some of our Constitution was a great borrowing exercise—taking wonderful ideas from other constitutions and laws and assembling them together in a wonderful document they put together in 1787, but there were a couple of ideas in the Constitution of 1787 that were not chosen from elsewhere, that were really unique to our country and are still unique. One of the unique ideas is this: War is not a matter for the Executive, the King, the Emperor, the Monarch, the Sultan, the Pope. No, war is a matter that needs to be declared by the people's elected legislative body.

That was revolutionary in 1787, and it is revolutionary today. The balance of power that was struck was that Congress would declare war, and then once declared, there would only be one Commander in Chief—535 Commanders in Chief would be a disaster. The decision to initiate war would be for Congress, and then the President, working in tandem with military leadership, would be the Commander in Chief to prosecute a war if declared, but there should be no shortcut and no substitute for the debate in this body before the initiation of war.

The amendment that will be on the table—and then hopefully we will receive a vote on—that is bipartisan in nature would prevent funding for a war against Iran unless there is a vote of Congress to authorize such a war.

The amendment does make clear that no previous congressional act—for example, the 2001 authorization—can be tortured and twisted and stretched and bootstrapped into a declaration of war against Iran. The administration has sort of been trying to lay that as a predicate, suggesting that an authorization that passed in 2001 that did not mention Iran would authorize war against Iran, when not a single person who voted for it in 2001 ever thought it was to be used in justification for war against Iran. The administration would like to try to use that as a justification, they have said, in testimony here on the Hill.

Think about this: If they are so afraid to come to Congress and ask for an authorization that they want to try to use something from 18 years ago, what does it tell us about their confidence that they have a good justification that we need to be in a war?

The amendment we have does not prevent the United States from defending itself from attack against Iran. The President has the power as Commander in Chief under Article II, and the War Powers Resolution specifies that power and doesn't codify it. It doesn't need to be codified, but it makes clear that power is always inherent in the Office of the President.

Our amendment doesn't suggest that Iran's behavior is acceptable or consistent with international norms. I have been part of many efforts over the course of my time in the Senate to impose sanctions on Iran if they violated, for example, ballistic missile protocols, U.N. sanctions, or rules, and if they engaged in human rights abuses. The purpose here is not to stand up and defend Iranian behavior, but it is to stand for the proposition that we shouldn't be committed to a war without a vote of Congress.

I will say that this administration's actions and rhetoric have been unnecessarily provocative. It was the United States that pulled out of a diplomatic deal that was working, not Iran. When President Trump pulled out of the diplomatic deal at the time he did, his then-Secretary of State, Rex Tillerson; his then-Secretary of Defense, James Mattis; his then-National Security Advisor, General McMaster; his then and current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of

Staff, Gen. Joseph Dunford—all said that the Iran deal was working, that Iran was complying with it, and that the United States should stay in it. The President pulled out of the diplomatic deal nevertheless and in the year since has reimposed sanctions and taken a number of steps that are provocative toward Iran—diplomatic provocation, rhetorical provocation, economic provocation, and military provocation.

We have been having a set of briefings—some classified—from the administration on this. I am not going to get into classified material, but one thing I will acknowledge—and I am impressed by this—is the administration's intel experts, when they brief us on the situation—even yesterday—they will state that Iran's activities are—and this is pretty much a direct quote—in response to the ''U.S. Maximum Pressure'' campaign.

The ''U.S. Maximum Pressure'' campaign that started with the United States backing out of the diplomatic deal is leading to Iran taking other actions that we don't like, but they are not taking those actions unprovoked. Their actions need to be understood as a response to the ''U.S. Maximum Pressure'' campaign.

Senator MERKLEY talked about it. We pulled out of the deal. We reimposed sanctions. We designated part of the Iranian Government as a foreign terrorist organization. We misrepresented routine military operations in the region. We moved more troops and Patriot missiles and aircraft carriers and other military material into Iran's region. This is not their moving material into our region; it is our moving material into their neighborhood.

Just this week, the administration announced the deployment of an additional 1,000 troops to the Middle East to counter Iran, and that is what this administration is doing—a ''U.S. Maximum Pressure'' campaign that tears up diplomacy and thus raises the risk of unnecessary war.

I will also point out that it is not just U.S. activity that is provoking Iran. When the United States allows Saudi Arabia to get missiles they shouldn't have and when the United States observes the Saudis building a missile program—by public reports, possibly with the support of China—that is viewed as very dangerous by Iran. When the United States transfers nuclear technology to Saudi Arabia—not even briefing Congress about it—and the Saudis say they would try to build up a nuclear arsenal to counter Iran, it is a provocation. So the maximum pressure by the United States and nations like Saudi Arabia are leading to an unnecessary escalation of tension in the region.

I want to conclude because my colleague from New Mexico, who is the author of this, also wants to speak about why we need to take it up, but let me just say this. I am going to state my position for the record.

I think another war in the Middle East now would be a disaster. I think it would be catastrophic for the United States to tear up a diplomatic deal and then look our troops in the face and say ''Because we tore up a diplomatic deal, you have to now go fight another war'' when we have been in the Middle East for 18 years. I think it would represent just about as catastrophic a failure of American foreign policy as you could imagine.

I think it would also have the disadvantage of taking our eye off the ball. I have always been taught to keep the main thing the main thing. I think the main thing right now in national security for the United States is to keep our eye on our principal competitor, which is China. When we take our eye off our principal competitor and we engage in wars we needn't be in, China will be the victor in that. That is a very dangerous thing for us.

So I think it would be catastrophic for the United States to be engaged in another war in the Middle East, particularly a war against Iran right now. But if the President feels differently about that; if some of his advisers think we ought to be about regime change in Iran, as they have said; if some of them think it would be easy to beat Iran in a war, as they have said; if some colleagues here on the floor think we should be in a war with Iran, as some have publicly urged, let them come to the floor of the Senate, in full view of the American people, and make that argument.

Let's have that argument right here in the greatest deliberative body in the world with the American public watching, and I will make my argument about why a new war in the Middle East would be catastrophic and see who wants to stand up and make the argument that a new war in the Middle East is something this great Nation should do. And if we then have that argument and cast a vote and I lose, I am going to be disappointed, but we will have done what the Constitution suggests that we must do.

Our failure to have that debate is so unfair to our troops. It is unfair to our troops to put them in harm's way with Congress hiding under their desk, not being willing to state yea or nay on whether we should be engaged in hostilities.

Let's honor the troops and the sacrifice we would ask them to make, follow the Constitution, and have this debate before the American public. That is what the amendment would essentially guarantee that this body would do, and that is why I so strongly support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I thank you for the recognition, and let me thank the two Senators that preceded me here. Senator MERKLEY spoke on this issue of whether we should be going to another war in the Middle East, and Senator KAINE, whom I have watched since he has been in the Senate, has been relentless and very consistent about raising the issues of authorizations of force and relying on authorizations of force from 2001 and 2002—what we consider very outdated in terms of looking at the facts on the ground. I know he has been working hard—Senator KAINE has—in the Armed Services Committee. Both of us have been working in the Foreign Relations Committee to try to address this constitutional issue that is really before us.

I came to the floor of the Senate 4 weeks ago warning that this administration's reckless escalation of tensions with Iran was blindly leading us to the brink of war. I urged this body to assert its constitutional authority and pass my bipartisan legislation, the Prevention of Unconstitutional War with Iran Act. I called on all of us, Republicans and Democrats, to make it clear that the President alone cannot wage war against Iran without authorization from Congress.

Well, here we are, 1 month later, and tensions with Iran have only increased. The threat of conflict has only drawn closer. Today, we woke up to the news that Iranian forces shot down a U.S. drone. That comes on the heels of 1,000 American troops being sent to the Middle East. Yet the Senate does nothing—nothing to assert Congress's constitutional authority and nothing to assume the responsibility that the Founders clearly placed on our shoulders, the people's representatives.

The Republican leadership should not duck all debate on the military conflict with Iran. We need to vote. We owe it to our men and women in uniform, whose lives would be put on the line, to have this debate, to make the hard choices, and to take the tough votes.

Today, we are calling for a vote on an amendment to the 2020 National Defense Authorization Act. The amendment prohibits funding for military operations against Iran without explicit authorization from Congress. I am joined in this amendment by Senators KAINE, DURBIN, PAUL, MERKLEY, and MURPHY. My related bill has 25 cosponsors and still counting.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution couldn't be clearer. It is Congress and Congress alone that has the authority to declare war. This amendment recognizing Congress's clear-cut authority should have broad bipartisan support. Whether you support armed conflict with Iran or believe that the war would be a disaster, you should have the courage to cast a vote when the Constitution says it is your job.

Let's be clear. This bill does not tie our Armed Forces' hands. Our military is highly capable, and we have an inherent right of self-defense, which this amendment clearly underscores. But we need to step up. The situation is more urgent day by day.

The President and Secretary of State have accused Iran of being responsible

for the attack on two oil tankers last week. Iran has denied that involvement. There is a somewhat conflicting report from the Japanese tanker owner. I do not know whether Iran, its surrogates, or another party is responsible for this heinous action, but this administration's itch to go to war is all too reminiscent of how we got embroiled in Iraq in 2003 and how the disastrous tanker war of the 1980s began.

We must not make the same terrible mistakes again. We do need to find out precisely what happened and who is responsible, but the response need not be another endless war in the Middle East. We need a thorough and objective investigation of this incident, as has been called for by a number of nations, and the Senators need a real intelligence briefing that covers sources and evidence and not just a statement of opinions from administration officials.

If the Trump administration is entering our forces into hostilities, then this Congress should demand that a report be submitted to Congress in accordance with the War Powers Act. Those who wrote that act made it clear: ''Hostilities also encompasses a state of confrontation in which no shots have been fired, but denotes a situation in which there is a clear potential either for such a state of confrontation or for actual armed conflict.'' We may have already crossed this threshold. Some have said we have.

The Reagan administration failed to submit such a report to Congress during the tanker wars, and the Congress failed to hold that administration accountable, despite the overwhelming evidence of hostilities.

Now, the current administration has hinted that it does not need to go to Congress for approval for hostilities against Iran. They seem to believe that the 9/11 AUMF gives them legal authority for war. Many of us in Congress today voted for that AUMF, including myself, and let me be clear—no one who voted for it thought it would be used to justify a war against Iran 18 years later. Congress needs to make that clear before it is too late.

Yes, the Strait of Hormuz, the Persian Gulf, and the Gulf of Oman should be safe from navigation. Vital interests are at stake. But I agree with the statement issued by the U.S. Central Command in the aftermath of this recent attack:

> We have no interest in engaging in a new conflict in the Middle East. We will defend our interests, but a war with Iran is not in our strategic interest, nor in the best interest of the international community.

A war with Iran is not in our strategic interest, and a majority of Americans agree. The American people are tired of forever wars in the Middle East that take our resources, produce no strategic gains, and, most tragically, endanger the lives of American men and women.

In any war with Iran, we will have few allies to back us. The international community is not behind the National Security Advisor and Secretary of State's bellicose rhetoric. We would have to go it nearly alone.

The administration's maximum pressure strategy is supposedly intended to bring Iran to the negotiating table, but this strategy has predictably failed to produce any negotiations or make any diplomatic inroads. Instead, it is emboldening the hardliners in Tehran who also want confrontation.

The administration's pulling out of the Iran nuclear agreement was a colossal strategic blunder. It was supposedly intended to get the U.S. a better deal, but violating our obligations has only produced saber-rattling, brinksmanship, and the very real risk that a miscalculation or mistake will result in an all-out war.

The United States and the world were safer with the Iran nuclear agreement. It included strict verification requirements. The International Atomic Energy Agency and the President's own intelligence and defense teams agreed that Iran was complying.

The unilateral withdrawal only undermined relations with our allies, signaled that the United States will not keep its word, and destabilized the Middle East even more. This was a predictable result and many warned the Trump administration about this outcome.

Iran threatens to exceed the agreement's limits on nuclear fuel within days. While I hope Iran holds to its end of the bargain, the United States pulling out of the agreement and reimposing sanctions has opened the door for Iran to walk away as well.

Now we must do all we can over the next 17 months to make sure this President does not precipitously start a war with Iran, a country of 80 million people, about four times the size of Iraq, and with proxy forces throughout the region. A war would cost trillions of dollars and undoubtedly American lives. With each passing day and with each incident, the risk of a catastrophic war grows closer.

I realize some of my colleagues have a different view of the situation. Some talk about how all options must be on the table or say that the Iranian regime must be overthrown. I hope they reconsider and change their minds.

If they don't, they should at least have the courage of their convictions. If you want to empower this President to fight a war with Iran, let's vote on that question. The American people and our men and women in uniform deserve to know that their representatives will debate, discuss, and vote on these most difficult of decisions. That is why all of us in this body must demand that this amendment be heard, debated, and voted on. Senate gridlock cannot be an excuse.

The Constitution puts this decision squarely in our court. It is long past time for Congress to reassert its war powers authority. Our oath demands that we make any decision to go to war. The real possibility that this administration will precipitate conflict in Iran requires us to face this question now. The fact that American lives will be on the line places the moral imperative on us to debate this issue and to make clear to the President and his administration that any decision to go to war with Iran must be made by Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the National Defense Authorization Act and to highlight amendments that I have sponsored or cosponsored to enhance opportunities for servicemembers and their families.

The NDAA represents one of the Senate's most important responsibilities. It authorizes funding to support our servicemembers, including those who are serving in harm's way. It sets policy for our Nation's military and authorizes critical national defense priorities. It is vitally important to ensure that our men and women in uniform, as well as our Department of Defense civilians, have the training, ships, planes, vehicles, and other equipment they need to help defend our Nation and its interests.

I commend Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED and the other Members of the Armed Services Committee for their leadership and bipartisan work on this important legislation. They have done an excellent job.

This bill contains many provisions that are important to the State of Maine and to our Nation. To cite just a few items, I am pleased that the NDAA includes authorization for three Arleigh Burke destroyers, 94 fifth-generation Joint Strike Fighter aircraft, and six CH–53K King Stallion helicopters. These essential ships and aircraft will help to ensure that our military maintains its superiority in both the seas and skies. I also strongly support the 3.1 percent pay increase that members of the Armed Forces will receive when this bill is signed into law.

In addition, the NDAA expresses our commitment to key international partners and allies. For example, the bill includes a full $500 million authorization to continue the cooperative missile defense programs with Israel, which are becoming increasingly vital in that volatile region. It also provides additional security assistance for Ukraine to help check continued Russian aggression on its eastern and southern borders.

To build on the impressive work done by Chairman INHOFE and the rest of the committee, I have introduced amendments to improve benefits for military widows, increased access to and awareness of Department of Defense and VA apprenticeship programs, and improved temporary duty travel lodging for DOD employees, such as those serving at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, ME.

The first amendment, which I am pleased to join my colleague Senator

DOUG JONES in sponsoring, calls for the elimination of a longtime inequity in the Survivor Benefit Plan and the Dependency and Indemnity Compensation Plan. This inequity, which causes there to be an offset between the two programs, is commonly known as the military widow's tax. This unfair offset is currently preventing as many as 65,000 surviving spouses—more than 260 of them in Maine—from receiving the full benefits that they deserve.

The Department of Defense's Survivor Benefits Plan, or SBP, is primarily an insurance benefit that military families purchase, usually in their retirement, and it provides cash benefits to a surviving spouse or other eligible recipients when the military retiree passes away. On the other hand, the Department of Veterans Affairs Dependency and Indemnity Compensation Program, known as DIC, is a monthly tax-free payment to survivors and dependents of servicemembers who pass away from service-related conditions.

For example, if a military retiree pays premiums into the insurance program, then, their spouse ought to be able to receive those benefits when the retiree passes away. However, what we find instead is that if the surviving spouse receiving SPB insurance payment is also eligible for the separate payment from the VA, there is a dollar-for-dollar offset. In some cases this leads to the total elimination of the Service Benefit Plan. In other cases, the offset greatly reduces the amount that is received. In either case, it is out and out unfair, and it harms survivors of our servicemembers and military retirees.

I am often reminded by our military commanders that you recruit the soldier, but you retain the family. We have an obligation to make sure that we are taking care of our military families, who have sacrificed so much.

This problem goes back decades, but this year can be the time that we finally solve it. With more than 75 Senators—three-quarters of the Senate—and 340 Members of the House of Representatives supporting this effort as cosponsors of the stand-alone bill, this is the year. It is our time to do our duty, not only to support the brave men and women of our military but also to honor our commitment to their families.

I would urge all of my colleagues to join in this effort and to support the repeal of the military widow's tax as part of the National Defense Authorization Act, and, indeed, Senator JONES and I have introduced an amendment to do just that.

Mr. President, the second amendment I wish to discuss is one that I have introduced with Senator KLOBUCHAR. It would authorize servicemembers transitioning to civilian life to carry out skills training, apprenticeships, and internship programs at other Federal Agencies, in addition to the private sector. Currently, the military services are permitted to authorize servicemember participation in job training, including apprenticeships and internships, beginning up to 6 months before their service obligation in the military is complete. In a recent report to Congress, the Department of Defense recommended that we expand this authority to allow for inclusion of Federal Agencies as well as the private sector as participants.

I am very grateful to Chairman INHOFE and to Senator REED for recently accepting this amendment and including it as part of the NDAA managers' amendment. That will ensure that these provisions are included in the Senate bill. This is a win-win for both servicemembers as well as Federal Agencies, as this simple expansion will create new opportunities for individual members of the military and allow the Federal Government to benefit from the talents that our highly trained soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines bring to their careers subsequent to their military service. It is a commonsense reform that will expand access to apprenticeships to our servicemembers and ease their transition.

Third is an amendment that I introduced with Senator CANTWELL. It would require the Department of Defense, in coordination with the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Labor, to report on their efforts to promote the utilization of apprenticeships and on-the-job training by servicemembers transitioning out of the military. So, obviously, this report is very much related to the earlier amendment that I just described.

The dramatic underutilization of apprenticeship and on-the-job training under the GI bill demonstrates the need to promote these vital programs. In fiscal year 2018, fewer than 1,500 veterans participated in apprenticeships and fewer than 1,400 participated in the other kinds of on-the-job training, and that is out of a universe of over a million beneficiaries of the VA's educational programs.

One obvious benefit of apprenticeship programs is that graduates learn hands-on skills for jobs that will immediately be available to them, and there are many of these kinds of good-paying jobs available in the State of Maine and elsewhere today.

Finally, there is an amendment that I have introduced with Senators SHAHEEN, KING, and HASSAN. This would address significant problems that the Department of Defense workers at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, ME, and elsewhere in the country have encountered with the Department's Integrated Lodging Pilot Program, which was initially authorized in the 2015 NDAA. The intent of the pilot program was to save money by assigning TDY lodging first at government facilities and then at specific commercial lodging at prenegotiated rates. However, what we have seen with employees at our shipyard is that they are often being forced to stay in subpar or inconvenient lodging—sometimes, in areas that simply are not safe.

Workers have shared stories with me and with the other members of the Maine and New Hampshire delegations about being awoken in the middle of the night to the sounds of loud shouts while staying at required government lodging, as well as more serious incidences of robberies and shootings nearby. In other cases, travelers describe staying in remote lodging on military installations without security or desk attendants nearby to resolve standard issues that are ordinarily addressed quickly at commercial hotels—basic things like dealing with room keys that don't work or addressing other problems in the hotel rooms.

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, in fact, has directed its travel office to no longer use the Integrated Lodging Pilot Program for travel to at least one installation due to repeated problems with personnel who were promised lodging only to find that it was not even available when they arrived, leaving these workers scrambling to find an alternative place to stay.

This was a pilot project that simply did not work. It is for these reasons that I have joined my colleagues from Maine and New Hampshire in introducing an amendment that simply allows this pilot program to end in December of this year as currently scheduled. This program may be something worth revisiting after we straighten out the problems with it—certainly, after Congress reviews the still uncompleted DOD report on the pilot. But for the time being, it clearly has not worked well for the workers at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and other DOD employees, and it should be allowed to expire at the end of this year.

I am very proud of the role that the State of Maine plays in our national defense. From the accounting center in northern Maine to the Air National Guard base in Bangor that refuels so many military aircraft, to contractors like Bath Iron Works, where we will christen a ship on Saturday in honor of our former colleague Senator Daniel Inouye, to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, to countless other smaller suppliers, the State of Maine is essential to our national security.

Enactment of this bill is vitally important to the security of our Nation. I would encourage my colleagues to support the underlying bill, as well as these commonsense amendments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

GUN SAFETY

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues who have come to the floor this week to call for action to prevent gun violence.

On Tuesday we marked the 4-year anniversary of the horrific shooting at the Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston, where a White supremacist killed nine people during Bible study.

Last week was the 3-year anniversary of the massacre at Pulse nightclub in

Orlando, when an act of terror and hatred took the lives of 49 people in the LGBTQ community.

After each of these tragedies, we say ''never again'' and ''enough is enough.'' But after each mass shooting, Congress fails to take action. The discussion fades into the background until another tragedy occurs, then this same cycle is repeated.

It is unacceptable that Congress has still yet to take meaningful action to address this epidemic. The victims who have been lost, their families, and those who have experienced life-changing injuries and trauma deserve action—as do all of our communities, because nearly every aspect of American life has been afflicted by gun violence.

Nowhere is the impact of gun violence and the way it has changed our lives more clear than in our Nation's schools. Just this year, a friend of mine's son started kindergarten. Shortly after the school year started, he and his other kindergarten peers had to participate in a drill—what to do if there is an active shooter or danger in your school.

At about the same time that my friend received information from the school that her son would be participating in a lockdown of sorts—a lockdown for 5-year-olds—she read an article by a teacher who had participated with her young students in such an active shooter drill. When the teacher got the kids still and turned off the lights in the room so they could practice staying safe, she noticed the little lights in the soles of their sneakers. You know those little light-up shoes that children have? The teacher wrote that she realized that if those children came to school with those shoes on a day when there was a shooter, even with the lights down, they would be targets. Well, needless to say, my friend's son no longer has light-up sneakers.

It is time to finally meet words with action. It is time to finally take steps to keep the American people safe. It is time to finally pass commonsense gun laws.

A good start to address this public safety issue would be to improve our background check system. According to the Department of Justice, since 1994 background checks have stopped over 3 million dangerous individuals from obtaining guns, including people with violent criminal records, domestic abusers, and those with mental health issues.

But we know that there continue to be loopholes in that system. Research indicates that millions of guns are sold each year to individuals without background checks. We need to extend background checks to all gun sales and ensure that people who are legally barred from owning guns cannot easily access them.

I have joined with Senator MURPHY, who has been a passionate, dedicated leader on this issue, on legislation to do just that. Earlier this year, the House of Representatives passed bipartisan gun safety legislation aimed at improving our background check system. There is real momentum and urgency on this issue. Strengthening background checks is a measure that the American people overwhelmingly support.

Unfortunately, Republican leadership in the Senate is more focused on putting the priorities of the gun lobby ahead of the will of the American people. It is outrageous that some in this body suggest that there is simply nothing that we can do to stop the gun violence that has plagued our country. The refusal to even bring up gun safety legislation for consideration is unconscionable. That must change.

I come from a State with a long tradition of responsible gun ownership. People across New Hampshire own guns for hunting, sports, and protection. I respect the tradition, and I am committed to upholding it, but I know that the people in New Hampshire don't want dangerous weapons in the wrong hands. They are also deeply frustrated that Congress has refused to address the heartbreaking acts of violence that have become far too common in our country. Granite Staters, particularly our young people, are speaking out to voice these frustrations.

Last year, I was proud to march with students in Nashua who organized their own March For Our Lives rally, and students across our State have engaged in everything from writing to public officials to staging school walkouts. They are demanding that we take action, and Congress needs to listen to them.

I am going to keep pushing to pass commonsense gun safety laws, and it is long past time that the Senate finally take this issue up for debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO RECIPIENTS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL AWARD

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate this year's winners of the Congressional Award. Established by Congress in 1979, the award recognizes the achievements of young Americans between the ages of 14 and 23 years old and celebrates their accomplishment in four program areas: voluntary public service, personal development, physical fitness, and expedition/exploration.

The award challenges participants to set goals in an area that interests them, encouraging them to pursue new interests and grow along the way. If they successfully achieve their goals, they earn bronze, silver, and gold certificates and medals. Through the program, these young Americans gain new skills, earn greater confidence, and position themselves to be productive citizens.

Today, recipients of the gold medal will be presented with their Congressional Award at a ceremony here in our Nation's Capital. On behalf of the U.S. Senate, I would like to congratulate all of the winners for their accomplishments and for the example they set for others. Among this impressive group, my State of Kentucky is home to eight gold medalists. Through their efforts, the recipients of the 2019 Congressional Awards are strengthening their communities and our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of this year's recipients of the Congressional Award Gold Medal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alabama: Warren Griggs.

Arizona: Chantel Abdulai, Morgan Cryder, Ryan Jiang, Baya Laimeche, Alexis Massie, Rosemary Richards.

Arkansas: Sarah Douglass.

California: Flora Ahn, Yuna Baek, Logan Bhamidipaty, Pooja Bhatnagar, Madeline Brown, Abigail Brown, Amanda Cai, Andrew Chang, Casey Chang, Ann Chen, Yujin Choe, Jiseon Choi, Jung-yoon, Choi, David Choung, Joshua Yoon-Ho Chung, Evelyn Chung, Wesley Dale, Harmeen Dhariwal, Julia Dillenbeck, Joseph Dong, Claire Fernandez, Teresa Fundter, Andrew Funk, Scott Funk, Trenton Gin, Jeseung Han, Ye-Eun Han, Jennifer Ho, Andrew Hong, Mirabel Zixin Hu, Jacqueline Huff, Priscilla Hui, Dayeon Hwang, Seung Hyun Hwang, Justin Hyon, Carmina Inguito, Andrew Jockelle, Mindy Jun, Sky Jung, David Jung, Rachel Kang, Maisha Khanum, Ami Kim, Andrew Kim, AnneClare Kim, Calvin Kim, Elissa Kim, Evan Kim, Grace Goeun Kim, Grant Kim, Josephine Kim, Junhee Kim, Renny Kim, Stephanie Kim, Steve Kim, Sungmin Kim, Tiffany Kim, Faith Kim, Alex Kim-Man Klassen, Erin Kwak, Yohan Kwak, Chaerin Chloe Lee, Claire Lee, David Lee, Ethan Lee, Ethan Lee, Jiin Lee, Jisung Lee, Justin Lee, Kendra Lee, Seohyeong Lee, Suhwoo Lee, Sunghee Lee, Jae Hoon Lee, Jay Lee, Jeong Eun Lee, Kelly Li, Tina Xiaotian Li, Daniel Lim, Nicole Jiayi Liu, Mackenzie Lo, Megan Loh, Vinit Majmudar, Kenichi Matsuo, Kevin Mok, Evan Morgan, William Mun, Paris Nguyen, Hyerin Noh, Laura Noronha, Yuna Oh, Anthony O'Leary, Sena Oten, Aylen Park, Brian Park, Chelsie Park, Elisa Park, Esther Park, Hailey Park, Heejae Park, Hyoungjin Park, Julie Park, Noah Park, Rachel Park, Rachel Gia Park, Steven Park, Sung Yun Park, Weena Park, Eric Park, Akshat Patwardhan, Grace Pecheck, Isha Pema, Cris Plunkett, Nathan Pollon, Ethan Posard, Archit Raichura, Rene Servin, Sophia Shi, Jaeyong Shim, Katherine Simic, Helen Sohn, Joshua Son, Annette Son, Kenneth Song, Margaret Sugarman, Albert Sun, Colman Sun, Seraphine Sun, Loyalty Traster-Lee, Kenneth Jr. Um, Colin Wang, Jiahui Wang, Johnny Young Wang, Chuhan Wen, Samantha Wong, Richard Wu, Jack Xiao, Zifeng Xie, Qixiang Xiong, Andre Yeung, Aaron Yi, Danniel Yi, David Dongwon Yi, Brian Yoon, Na Won Yoon, Patrick Yu, Emily Yuan, Peter Ze, Tiffany Zha, Lin Yue Zhang, Yixuan Zhu.

Colorado: Nour Abouyoussef, Bahara Amiri, Adam Mohmand.

Connecticut: Emily Bergwall, Jack Ferreira, Madison Henry, Jake McGillion-Moore, James Munroe, Gabriella Owens.

Florida: Lorraine Angelakos, Jessica Bennett, Jennifer Carvel, Lauren Eavenson, Cole Ellis, Michael LaShon Everhart, Katherine Gates, Alexander Goetschius, Keelie Hanley, Rileigh Hanley, Royce Howley, Cassandra James, Hannah Komroff, Ruhika Lankalapalli, Mark Lee, Connor Murphy, Maura Null, Harrison O'Donnell, Ali Jean Paksima, Mariah Perez, Christian Petrisko, Derek Petrisko, Lillian Pinkham, Matthew Powers, Michael Powers, John R. Robinson, Tanner Smith, Taylor Stevens, Lindsey Suncine, Sierra Tagman, Lillian Tougas, Shravya Vasireddy.

Georgia: Ridhi Choragudi, David Edenfield, Sophia Emmoth, Baird Kazazian, Justin Lee, Manas Mudunuri, Cutler Shiver, Albert Zhang.

Hawaii: Emily De Wulf.

Idaho: Aila Carr-Chellman, Asher Carr-Chellman, Jules Carr-Chellman, Sydney Davis, Kyler Liscinski, Quincey Lochard, Jasmine Willis.

Illinois: Ajay Balaraman, Max Bowman, Julia Canellis, Robert Daniel Claud, Amanda Dynak, Jacob Furfine, Cole Goggio, Michael Miller, Audrey Pack, Katherine Pack, Tristan Taylor.

Indiana: Thaddaeus Broussard, Sai Chalasani, Amanda Feagans, Agrayan Gupta, Aryaman Gupta, Vahin Vuppalanchi.

Iowa: Amy Ryan.

Kansas: Jillian Gillen, Aasim Hawa, Lucas Lopatofsky, Aditi Malay, John Tomlinson.

Kentucky: Tierra Beard, Cammeron Durham, Benjamin Ferguson, Lucas Fortwengler, Demetrius Gunn, Nathanael Sangster, Alex Satterwhite, Alderic Senecal.

Maryland: Candace Anderson, Joseph Farroha, Orion Gangopadhyay, Alex Jin, Bridgette Kim, William Longsworth, Thomas Pallan, Elizabeth Rice, Jonathan Simak, Benjamin Smith, Robin Mia Tian.

Massachusetts: Michael Akerson, McAllister Bianchi, Justin Chang, Harsh Choudhary, Jean-Pierre De Jesus-De La Cruz, Yanxin Ma, Dwyn McNeil, Connor Ryan.

Michigan: Marvin Jiang.

Minnesota: Avery Lehr.

Mississippi: Jerry Clark, Jessi Davis, Taylor Fields, Jessica Gates, Jonah Holland, Jacob Lindsey, Morgan Lyons, Teiryne Miller, Cammie Moore, Kacilyn Pegues, Callie Philips, Mikayla Shelton, Maurissa Shumpert, CJ Weddle, T'ajahlon White.

Missouri: Bree Baker, Andrew Harrison Fruend, Robert Trey Fruend III, Abbey Grooms, Yijin Huang, Olivia Johanns, Nathanial Marsters, Vivian Marsters, Trevor Rey, Caitlin Souers, Divya Srihari.

Nebraska: Mary Aumen, Ambrose Terneus.

Nevada: Zachary Hammer, Ritvik Janamsetty, Salomee Levy, Zane Pasha.

New Hampshire: Sydney Richardson.

New Jersey: Zachary Asselta, Eunice Bae, Tanvi Bekal, Andre Biehl, Robert Cuff, Ciara DiMaiolo, Evan Doliszny, Caitlin D'Souza, James Foran, Anushka Iyer, Julia Jeong, Kunal Kanwar, Alexandra Kukal, James Joseph Laberee, Shannon Leahy, Krishna Parikh, Khushi Patel, Krishant Putrevu, David Takacs, Vicky Trieu.

New York: Kristen Brennan, Muhammed Colak, Madison Gorman, Blake Guzy, Becky Han, Joseph Hong, Tasneem Ibrahim, Saiomkar Iyer, Baird Johnson, Henry Lin, Jacqueline McCabe, Hannah Nyquist, Sophia Pao, Katherine Prior, Darshi Shah, Noah Stiles, Jacqueline Sutera, Olivia Zhou.

North Carolina: Abigail Amato, Lillian Amato, Angelina Bayrak, Kamin Bond, Carson Cook, Rucheer Dave, William David, Ashlyn Edmisten, Garrett Gerdau, Geoffrey Gerdau, Hattie Rose Greene, Cole Heinrich, Kylah Jackson, Grayson King, Sruthi Mannepalli, Aislinn Niimi, Alaina Randolph, Bryson Rose, Brett Sims, Kristina Vaher.

North Dakota: Lauren Knoll.

Ohio: Sai Ashish Bommasani, Ryan Brady, Grace Cousens, Rohan Desarapu, Paul Hager, Genevieve Hager van Carlowitz, Shravan Kalahasthy, lshita Kode, Manaswini Nedunuri, Varshini Odayar, Bailey Quitter, Pavan Raghupathy, Anjali Raju, Neha Rokkam, Emmanuel Augustin Scaria, Chatura Tamirisakandala, Samith Venkatesh, Heema Vyas.

Oklahoma: Ted Bigler, Pat Kane, Olivia Stump.

Oregon: Patrick Townsend.

Pennsylvania: Victoria Jawork, Josef Mueller, Juan Aleman IV, Ruby Chen, Rebekah Fodale, William Huang, Julia Jones, Ayush Sharma, Allison Yang, Alec Yarnoff.

Rhode Island: Grace Sowa.

South Carolina: Gunnar Hensley, Bella Kissell, Garrett May, Micah McKnight, Noah McKnight, Harrison Miller, Lucas Mayon.

Tennessee: Andrew Engebretsen, Christine Li, Mitchell Morrison.

Texas: Smriti Ahuja, Siddhant Ahuja, Hunter Beaton, Todd Christian, Paige Cromley, Connor Crowe, Saachi Dalal, Daniel Garza, Ashley Gibson, Sachi Kalvakaalva, Mamoon Khalid, Weronika Konwent, Shikha Lakhi, Jimmy Liu, Rehman Memon, Raheem Memon, Fernando Miranda-Fred, Matthew Mitchell, Elias Mosby, Samuel Mosby, Emily Kate Mosley, Rhea Mudnal, Grace Nemec, Vishreshta Pathak, Nevedita Ramachandran, Nikita Ramachandran, Cristian Roma, Ben Romero, Jana Sabri, Wilson Sands, Allison Sharer, Ashley Sharer, Ashley Turnage, David Wang.

Utah: Dua Azhar, Daimion Davis, Katelin Drennan, Kimberly Drennan, Fatima Faizi, Nihal Kariparduc, Thomas Klingonsmith, Sarah Shwani.

Vermont: Freedom Scott Guildford River Tansley.

Virginia: Isaac Beasey, Annika Jenkins, Sarni Kandil, Anne Kickert, Varun Kota, Madeleine LeBeau, Samantha Lee, Kasey Mize, Manvi Punukollu, Timothy Rah, Kayla Rothstein, Melina Seng, Ciara Smith, Sarah Valley.

Washington: Hailey Farrington, Trevor McArthur, Arya Selvam, Sarah Stewart, Phillip Wang, Rose Wittenmyer.

Washington, DC: Lee Clyne.

Wisconsin: Olivia McClain.

Wyoming: Alice Attebery, Mercedes Bartels, Alyssa Bedard, Sydney Bell, Makaylah Berkovitz, Madison Bindl, Abigael Bylow, Elijah Cole, Mykenzie Dean, Samantha Dijohn, Noah Dreiling, Abigail Fearneyhough, Emma Geringer, Andrew Gronning, Logan Grosz, James Hayes, Sydney Holies, Isabelle Houseman, Lane Hutchison, Caroline Johnson, Jayla Johnson, Katie Johnson, Makala Johnson, Lorin Jones, Michaiah Jones, Samantha Jurkowski, Maeve Knepper, Kamry Knotwell, Selena Landa, Megan Leavitt, Araceli Ledesma, Carmen Leon, Arianna Lewis, Taylor Maese, Jazy Manoukian, Zoey Mares, Mackenzie Marler, Alyssa Miller, Claudia Miller, Audrey Mitchell, Junuenth Morales, Abby Morillon, Quentin Moter, Johanna Moter, Tommy Neal, Thanh Nguyen, Adelle Ostrom, Kendra Ostrom, Tiffany Passehl, Cody Perkins, Julianna Pizzato, Ruth Potter, Emily Purifoy, Haley Purifoy, Chloe Rankin, Dylan Raymond, Nicole Reyes-Aguilar, Grace Ritschard, Lauren Salsgiver, Kathryn Sauerwein, Camden Schmidt, Abigail Shameklis, Jakob Shuey, Colby Stockton, Nicole Talkington, Amelia Van Winkle, Cassidy Weibel, Eleccia Wells, Micayla Whitfield, Taylor Wilson.

LANDMINES IN YEMEN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have spent much of my career in the Senate working to eradicate landmines, which kill and maim far more civilians than combatants. These insidious, inherently indiscriminate weapons often remain active for years or even decades after the fighting has ended and the soldiers have left, lying in wait for the unsuspecting footstep of a child on her way to school, or a farmer working in a field.

In 1997, the Yemeni Government signed the Mine Ban Treaty which outlaws the production, stockpiling, export, and use of anti-personnel mines. With the help of international donors, they made great strides in humanitarian demining, to the point that, by 2012, they were on the cusp of declaring the country landmine free. Unfortunately, the civil war between the Houthi rebels supported by Iran, and the Yemeni Government supported by the Saudi-led coalition, changed everything. The use of landmines made a resurgence, due to Iranian mines that the Houthis have planted by the thousands throughout the country. More than 9,000 Yemenis have reportedly been killed or injured by landmines, the overwhelming majority of them innocent civilians.

Children are especially vulnerable to mine accidents. They run and play; they explore open fields; they are curious about strange objects. Most children who step on a landmine will die from loss of blood before they can obtain medical attention, and the survivors often do not have access to the specialized care and support they need. Even children who do not become victims are affected by landmines in their communities. They cannot play or go to school without fearing for their lives, and they suffer from malnutrition when militants turn farmland into minefields.

As I have said many times before, the use of landmines is an affront to civilized societies. Regardless of who uses them, they are an illegitimate weapon, triggered by the victim, and are often used to terrorize and brutalize the innocent. They impede development for decades, even generations. In Vietnam today, for example, landmines continue to kill and injure civilians 44 years after the war ended. The Houthis' use of landmines cannot be justified any more than their use of child soldiers and other violations of the laws of war, and should stop immediately.

Similarly, the United States should stop supporting Saudi Arabia's indiscriminate bombing in Yemen which has caused thousands of civilian casualties. This war will not be won militarily, and the longer it drags on the more innocent people will pay the price, with their limbs, their livelihoods, and their lives.

The Department of State is supporting efforts to help locate and destroy landmines in Yemen, but far more needs to be done. Even though

the Yemeni army, the UN Development program, and nongovernmental organizations have cleared more than 300,000 mines in the country, it is estimated that at least 1 million remain.

The Leahy War Victims Fund, administered by the U.S. Agency for International Development, has provided artificial limbs, wheelchairs, rehabilitation, and vocational assistance to landmine survivors in many countries, and could be used in Yemen.

Yemen was an impoverished country before Iran and Saudi Arabia decided to go to war there, which has caused immense suffering among the Yemeni people. War crimes have been committed by both sides, and by providing weapons to the Saudis, we also are implicated. Every effort should be made to pressure the Houthis to stop using landmines and child soldiers, and the Saudis to stop their bombing of civilian areas. The Department of State should increase its support for humanitarian demining in Yemen, and the U.S. Agency for International Development should increase its support for organizations that help mine victims rebuild their lives.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, tomorrow, I will be back home in Burlington, VT, to take part in a joyous occasion. In an afternoon ceremony at the Ethan Allen Homestead, I will attend a naturalization ceremony in which 14 new Americans from 11 countries will be administered the Oath of Allegiance. The participants will be surrounded by family and friends as they stand proudly next to the American flag and formally became U.S. citizens. It will be an honor to stand with them.

As we celebrate these immigrants who will join our ranks as American citizens, today, on World Refugee Day, we must not forget the plight of millions of refugees who have not been as fortunate. Right now, there are over 70 million people across the globe who have been forcibly displaced from their home countries by the horrors of persecution, war, famine, and chaos. In 2018 alone, nearly 13.8 million people were newly displaced, meaning that 25 people were forced to flee their homes every single minute of 2018. Nearly half of all refugees are children under the age of 18, many of them just infants and toddlers.

On World Refugee Day, we must recommit ourselves to the hallowed American tradition of being a refuge for the persecuted and the oppressed. Welcoming refugees with dignity is not a Democratic or a Republican priority; it is the American way. We are a better country for it. No single administration will ever be able to erase that from our DNA as a nation of refugees and immigrants.

I couldn't think of a better way to highlight the indelible contributions of immigrants and refugees to our society than to share a personal story that my good friend, U.S. District Court Judge Bill Sessions, recently offered at a naturalization ceremony at Vermont's State House marking the 17th anniversary of 9/11. Judge Sessions' remarks came just months after he suffered a life-threatening injury, only to later discover that the medical professionals who helped save his life were the very same immigrants he had sworn in as American citizens years earlier.

I for one, am most grateful that they were here in America to save his life.

I ask unanimous consent that Judge Sessions' statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE WILLIAM K. SESSIONS III, VERMONT STATE HOUSE NATURALIZATION CEREMONY—SEPT. 11, 2018

I am going to tell you my story. Of course I'm not going to tell you my whole life story, just that part which relates to my injury and illness a number of months ago. So on one level I will share with you my story, my experience. But it really isn't about me. It's about all those who came to my aid. It's about wonderful people who have recently moved here to this country to pursue their dreams, and it's about what these folks do for all of us.

I've been a federal judge since 1995, about 24 years. One of my favorite parts of the job is to preside at naturalization ceremonies. Over the years, I've had ceremonies, in courtrooms, schools, museums, on boats and in legislative halls. Currently, there are 24 such ceremonies performed each year in Vermont, and between 700 and 800 people are sworn in as American citizens. I do two a year, aboard the Ticonderoga at Shelburne Museum and in the State House on September 11th of each year. The State House ceremony is very special. Patrick Leahy and I organized the first such ceremony on the first anniversary of the September 11th attack as a statement that we cherish what immigrants bring to this country, that our welcome to new citizens will not be diminished by the acts of terrorists. It's a large group of between 60 and 80 applicants for citizenship. We have held ceremonies on September 11th of each year ever since.

Naturalization ceremonies are joyous celebrations. The new citizens are from all over the world. In fact these ceremonies often evolve into celebrations of their own cultural traditions. Many come in their native dress, and all of their families share in their celebration. They come up after the ceremony for pictures with me. My photo must rest on hundreds of mantles.

There are a couple of themes that seem universal. First, they are all very happy. For many, this day is the culmination of a long struggle. Many have come from refugee camps in Bhutan or Nepal or war-torn areas, such as Somalia or Bosnia. Some were raised in Communist countries, including Russia, China and the Eastern Bloc countries. Some were from Central and South America, having come here to escape violence at home, and others were from Europe or Canada. They speak about their dreams of America. The American dream is so inspirational for so many new citizens: hope, freedom, education, employment. It is inspirational for us who have lived here all of our lives to be reminded that so many look to this country as a beacon of hope. And we are a multi-cultural community. We take pride in our diversity. The infusion of rich cultural traditions is in many ways our lifeblood.

At the same time, naturalization ceremonies mark transitions from their homes and extended families to our community, and that transition is hard. They bring with them such rich cultural traditions, but often they see in their children the influence of the western community. Fernanda spoke to this—you feel caught between two worlds.

But where do they go after being naturalized? There have been over 12,000 new citizens sworn in since I have been a judge. That's a very significant portion of our whole community. Yet I never understood where they go. How do they integrate into our Western culture? Just what were they doing here that impacts all of us? Now I have a much greater understanding of what they contribute for all of us.

Now to my story. In late February, Abi and I were skating on the frozen fields of Blue Ledge farm, our daughter's and son-in-law's property. I took a fall backwards, striking my head on the ice. The sound could be heard throughout the county. I gathered myself. I seemed to have a headache, but not more. We skated back to the car. I of course did nothing.

Over the next two months I occasionally had minor headaches. It seemed like nothing more than a distraction. Things changed on a Sunday night in May. I had trouble speaking. Abi wanted to take me to the nearby ER, I said I'd visit a doctor the next day. John Barstow called. He in his own blunt way ordered I go to the ER. Two vs. one, so we went Sunday night. A CT scan was done and sent to the University of Vermont Medical Center. A neurosurgeon reviewed it and sent back the following message: I had massive bleeding in the brain, I was to be transported to Burlington, and he had scheduled brain surgery for 4 that morning.

So I remember very well meeting the neurosurgeon outside of the operating room. He explained the presence of blood and the movement of the brain from the pressure. He then waited for my response, but I couldn't answer him. I could not speak, I couldn't make a sound. He was an older man, almost a contemporary of mine. He put his hand on mine and said in a very kind way: ''We're going to make you all better.'' I could only nod.

I spent close to a month in the hospital, rotating between UVM Medical Center and Fanny Allen. One of my first observations was that people who took care of me were from all over the world. Those included nurses, medical technicians, and support staff. I just loved talking with them about their stories. They all had such pride in their cultural heritage. And they had such hope for their life here in the United States.

One day one of my favorite nurses said to me: ''You probably don't remember me, but you swore me in as an American citizen.'' I didn't remember her, but I felt an immediate connection. The ceremonies were special to both of us, and I felt a joy and a level of comfort that she was taking care of me. Also there was such a sense of small world.

During my hospitalization I had a number of setbacks that are common with this type of operation. Those setbacks took away my strength. They also impacted my ability to walk and to speak. I began occupational and physical therapy and speech pathology to relearn those skills. On the second day of meeting my occupational therapist, she told me that I had sworn her in as a citizen on September 11th at a State House ceremony. She brought the program for the ceremony the next day. Yes indeed, I was the judge who performed her ceremony. And in the course of my rehabilitation, I met a number of therapists, many of whom were either naturalized citizens or were married to naturalized citizens. So the answer to my original

question: Where do immigrants go to integrate into the community? Many go in to the health care community.

But then how about the neurosurgeon? He had reviewed the CT scan, ordered that I be transported to Burlington. He scheduled surgery at 4 a.m., and waited all night to perform the operation. And he was so kind to me before the operation.

My follow-up appointment with him was one month after the operation. Abi and I went to his office. A CT scan was done, which he showed us. The bleeding had stopped, the blood was all gone, and the brain had moved back to where it was supposed to be, about 2.2 cm. He then said to both of us: ''You will make a full recovery.'' As he was leaving the room, I said to him: ''Doctor, thank you for saving my life.'' He stopped, looked directly at me and said: ''You're welcome. And thank you, Judge.'' I had no idea why he would thank me and asked for what. His response: ''On September 11th, 2006, on the fifth anniversary of the attack on New York and Washington, at a ceremony at the State House in Montpelier, you swore me in as an American citizen. It was a very special day for me.''

So what have I learned from my experience? Immigrants bring to us their stories, the richness of their cultural traditions. This makes our community so much more diverse and interesting. We all benefit so much by their presence.

But now I look at the group being sworn in as citizens in a different light. Among the group may be nurses, medical technicians and aides who care for us when we are our most vulnerable; there may be therapists and speech pathologists who work to restore us who have been injured to our previous health; there may be doctors and surgeons who make life-altering decisions that may save our lives; there may be teachers and principals who care for and educate our children; there may be civil rights lawyers who defend our liberties, and police officers who protect us in the community. With the exception of native Americans we or our ancestors made that same voyage, often with those same dreams. We are them and they are us. We need to welcome them, but we also should thank them for all they do to make our community a safer, healthier and richer place in which to live.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to take the opportunity to join communities across the country and around the globe to commemorate the 19th observance of World Refugee Day.

Let me start with two sobering statistics from the UN agency charged with protecting refugees. The first is that 25 people were forced to flee their homes every minute of last year. The second is that more than 70 million people have now been forcibly displaced by conflict and persecution, the highest number the UN refugee agency has ever seen. So suffice it to say that the global need is real.

Which is why it is so heartbreaking to see Donald Trump's repeated efforts to try and slam America's doors shut to the world's most vulnerable.

It is particularly outrageous that the Trump folks aren't even on track to admit their own historically low cap of 30,000 refugees this year.

Let's be clear: Turning away refugees isn't some cornerstone of conservatism. Ronald Reagan admitted tens of thousands of refugees, so did George W. Bush.

In another era, that would have included my family, who fled Nazi persecution in the 1930s, seeking sanctuary in this country. I would have never had the honor of representing my State of Oregon here in this body had America sent my parents away.

Now, Edith and Peter Wyden aren't exactly household names, but here are a few that should be: Madeleine Albright, Albert Einstein, Gloria Estefan, Mila Kunis, and Elie Wiesel.

America is so much the richer for their contributions to diplomacy, physics, music, film and television, literature, and more.

So there is a practical reason for accepting refugees: Doing so makes America better.

There is also a moral reason for accepting refugees. Faith traditions speak of it as a duty to repair the world or to welcome the stranger. In Oregon, we just call it the right thing to do.

America is better than the administration's cruel and callous policies. I remain committed to challenging Donald Trump's exclusionary, anti-refugee policies on all fronts, and I challenge my colleagues to do the same.

Folks are looking to the Senate for strong, principled leaders. They want more than rhetoric; they want results.

So I urge my colleagues in the strongest terms to honor this World Refugee Day by rolling up their sleeves and working to revive America's historic, bipartisan commitment to the plight of refugees around the world.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, it has been said many times before, but it bears repeating today more than ever, on World Refugee Day—ours is a country built by immigrants. We have a proud tradition of welcoming foreigners to our shores.

The first European settlers in North America—those who founded our original Thirteen Colonies—were fleeing religious oppression and persecution. Over the following decades, America became, in the words of Thomas Paine, ''the asylum for the persecuted.'' We welcomed Irish Catholics fleeing starvation and British rule, Germans fleeing political turmoil, Eastern European Jews fleeing the pogroms, and countless others. Over the generations, America welcomed Europeans displaced by war, and later, millions of refugees seeking political asylum from Communism during the Cold War.

In 1980, we passed landmark legislation—the Refugee Act—which provided a permanent and systemized procedure for admitting refugees. This law established the concept of a Presidential determination on refuge admissions, by which the President can set the number of refugees that the United States may admit in a given year. For the past 40 years, both Democratic and Republican administrations demonstrated a commitment to robust resettlement. Prior to the Trump administration, the average annual refugee admissions cap was 95,000 refugees. Administration officials of both parties took seriously the Presidential determination and worked to maintain a resettlement rate on par with it.

At nearly every juncture in history since its founding, America has been called upon to be a leader in welcoming the persecuted. More often than not, we have answered that call and today, it sounds to us louder than ever. With more than 24 million refugees around the globe, America must step into our historic leadership role, not away from it.

Now is the time to increase the refugee admissions ceiling, not cut it. Now is the time to build up our resettlement infrastructure, not decimate it. Now is the time to open our door, not close it. But the Trump administration betrayed the foundational values of this Nation by slashing our annual refugee admissions ceiling to a dismal 30,000 refugees. This was an unprecedented low, both in number and humanity. That is why I introduced the GRACE Act. This bill prohibits any U.S. President from setting an admission ceiling below 95,000 refugees each year and requires administration officials to treat that figure as a goal.

We must not be silent. We must continue to meet the global crisis of displaced persons head on, and like our forefathers, we must extend a hand to those fleeing persecution around the word. Thank you.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DYLAN WICHMAN

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Dylan Wichman, of Billings, for his impact on the Yellowstone community and surrounding areas.

Dylan, only a rising senior at Billings Central High School, earned second place at the State Science Fair and took first at Montana State University-Billings' regional fair for his wildfire predictive and preventative algorithm, FASTCAT. Dylan also participated in the International Science Fair in Phoenix, AZ alongside 1,800 other students from 80 countries. Dylan earned third place in his category.

Inspired by the tragic Paradise Fire in 2018, Dylan put in countless hours to develop FASTCAT. FASTCAT is an algorithm used to predict the size of wildfires before they even occur, to ensure Montanans will be safer and more prepared during fire season. Dylan's artificial intelligence algorithm utilizes a neutral network model, ensuring the algorithms ability to problem solve as more data is input and analyzed. His innovative creation is an impressive improvement in Montana's existing fire safety and prevention programs. Dylan hopes to see his system implemented State and nationwide and globally in the future. Dylan will continue to work on his program alongside a professor at University of Montana next year.

I congratulate Dylan on his outstanding achievements and willingness to give back to his community. I look forward to seeing his success in his future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL DOUGLAS ANDERSON

● Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, today I wish to honor BG Douglas Anderson, who has distinguished himself during his more than 37 years of service to the U.S. Army and this Nation. Throughout the duration of his career, Brigadier General Anderson has served in positions of increased responsibility and trust, culminating as the commanding general of the 9th Mission Support Command at Fort Shafter, HI.

As the commanding general of the 9th Mission Support Command in the Pacific, Brigadier General Anderson has commanded the missions of 31 diverse units, encompassing more than 3,400 soldiers and civilians in three countries, five States and Territories, and crossing seven time zones. In this role, he rapidly increased the organization's readiness level to the highest levels the organization had seen in decades.

During his tenure, Brigadier General Anderson served in leadership, staff, and command assignments in light, ranger, airborne, and mechanized infantry units; commanded a Logistics Support Battalion; was the senior adviser to an Infantry Brigade of the Iraqi Army; the division director of human resources; commanded a personnel services brigade; was the director of the 80th Training; Command Operations/Planning/Training; commanded the 97th Training Brigade; commanded the Great Lakes Training Division; served as the deputy commanding general for the 63rd Regional Support Command; and was the director of the Army Reserve Engagement Cell, and deputy commanding general of the U.S. Army Reserve, U.S. Army Pacific. He has also served in numerous joint and overseas deployments and assignments in Iraq and Republic of Korea.

Brigadier General Anderson was commissioned in May 1988 as a distinguished military graduate of the Reserve Officer Training Corps program at Washington State University. He is a graduate of numerous military courses, including Infantry Officer Basic Course, Armor Officer Advanced Course, Engineer Officer Advanced Course (Tactics), U.S. Marine Corps Amphibious Warfare School, Combined Arms and Services Staff School, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, U.S. Army War College, Advanced Joint Professional Military Education Course, Canadian Security Studies Program, and United Nations Senior Mission Leader's Course. He is an Army joint planner and joint qualified officer.

Brigadier General Anderson holds a bachelor's degree in political science and public administration, a master's degree in human resources management, and a master's degree in strategic studies.

Brigadier General Anderson's leadership provided direct and tangible benefits to the Army, government and contracted civilians, citizen soldiers, and their family members. His outstanding service and contributions, coupled with a tireless devotion to duty, a strong love for this country and the soldiers and civilians who protect it, will have an enduring impact.

Brigadier General Anderson is married and has three children. He calls Atlanta, GA, home. Our Nation thanks him and his family for their dedicated service.●

TRIBUTE TO PEG SEMINARIO

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, I rise to pay tribute to Peg Seminario, a fierce advocate for working people with more than 40 years leading the AFL–CIO and the labor movement in fighting for stronger protections and safer worker conditions for workers.

Peg has led the AFL–CIO's safety and health program since 1990 and throughout her career has played a leading role in the fight to promulgate strong health and safety standards pertaining to major hazards facing workers, including asbestos, lead, silica, noise, and ergonomics. In fact, she has had a hand in every major health and safety rule adopted since 1977—almost all of which were adopted since the inception of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, OSHA.

She has pushed Congress to protect and enhance the provisions of the OSH Act; to increase Federal funding for critical worker protection Agencies, including the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the Mine Safety and Health Administration, and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health; and worked tirelessly to see that first responders who responded after the 9/11 attack and suffered illnesses as a result received the necessary medical care they need and deserve.

I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing Mrs. Seminario's distinguished career and thanking her for her efforts to protect the health and safety of workers in America.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL ASSANTE

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Michael Assante, a leader, a visionary, and a patriot who has contributed so much to protect our Nation's critical infrastructure and our interests around the world.

Michael Assante began his impressive career as an intelligence officer in the U.S. Navy where he learned the intricacies of cyber security defenses. After leaving the Navy, Mike became the chief information security officer at one of the largest U.S. utilities, American Electric Power. Mike continued to work in the private sector in the field of cyber security before he joined Idaho National Laboratory, INL, as a critical infrastructure protection specialist. At INL, Michael Assante assembled a unique team of computer experts, power engineers, control systems technicians, grid operators, infrastructure designers, law enforcement officials, and U.S. military special forces officers to tackle the most challenging cyber threats to critical infrastructure. This team has an impressive list of successes and its work continues to this day.

As Mike's accomplishments and recognition grew, he left INL and assumed senior positions at the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, the Council on CyberSecurity, the Center for Internet Security, NexDefense, the SANS Institute, and the Center for Strategic and International Studies. In all of these capacities, Michael Assante brought unique insights and strategies to the effort to protect our critical infrastructure from cyberattack. It was during this time that Mike became a resource to me and my staff, and he helped us better understand the magnitude of the cyber threat to our grid and opportunities for engineered solutions to interrupt the kill chain and mitigate the threat.

As a result of more than two decades of dedication, hard work, and impact, Michael Assante has a long list of noteworthy publications, collaborations, recognitions, and awards, but perhaps his greatest legacy is the thousands of professionals he trained to help protect our Nation's critical infrastructure.

Most Americans, including Mike's family and friends, will never know how much he did to protect U.S. national security interests. As a member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I can tell you that he is a giant in his field, and our country is safer because of his efforts. We are grateful for his many contributions.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–1719. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Modification of the Handling Regulations for Area No. 2'' ((7 CFR Part 948) (Docket No. AMS–SC–18–0067)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture , Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1720. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Melamine Formaldehyde Polycondensate Resin; Tolerance Exemption'' (FRL 9994–34–OCSPP) received in the

Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1721. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL 9994–67–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1722. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Pilot Program to Establish the Government Lodging Program; Department of Defense Report on the Integrated Lodging Pilot Program (ILPP)'' ; to the Committees on Armed Services; Appropriations; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1723. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Wildfire Suppression Aircraft Transfer Act of 1996'' (RIN0790–AK42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1724. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Restricting the Temporary Sojourn of Aircraft and Vessels to Cuba'' (RIN0694–AH87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1725. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties'' (31 CFR Parts 501, 510 , 535, 536, 539, 541, 542, 544, 546, 547, 548, 549, 560, 561, 566, 576, 583, 584, 588, 592, 594, 595, 597, and 598) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1726. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on appropriations legislation within seven days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC–1727. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to List the Chambered Nautilus as Threatened Under the Endangered Species Act'' (RIN0648–XE685) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1728. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements for the 2012 PM2.5 NAAQS'' (FRL No. 9995–41–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1729. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Open Burning Rules'' (FRL No. 9995–42–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1730. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Industry and Analysis, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of New Commerce Section 232 Exclusions Portal'' (RIN0694–AH55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 13, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1731. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Housing and Urban Development Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2018 through March 31, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1732. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''U.S.. Department of Health and Human Services Met Many Requirements for the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 but Did Not Fully Comply for Fiscal Year 2018'' ; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1733. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to a vacancy in the position of Director, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1734. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of MAB–CHMINACA in Schedule I'' ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA–421)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1735. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Furanyl Fentanyl, 4-Fluoroisobutyryl Fentanyl, Acryl Fentanyl, Tetrahydrofuranyl, and Ocfentanil in Schedule I'' ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA–490)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1736. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2018 Annual Determination To Implement the Sea Turtle Observer Requirement'' (RIN0648–BG90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1737. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to List the Taiwanese Humpback Dolphin as Endangered Under the Endangered Species Act'' (RIN0648–XE571) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1738. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rulemaking to Designate Critical Habitat for the Main Hawaiian Islands Insular False Killer Whale Distinct Population Segment'' (RIN0648–BC45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1739. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status of the Gulf of Mexico Bryde's Whale'' (RIN0648–XD669) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–95. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to provide adequate funding to the United States Army Corps of Engineers for the completion of the proposed project to deepen the Mississippi River Ship Channel to fifty feet; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 131

Whereas, deepening of the Mississippi River Ship Channel to fifty feet is a historic infrastructure project that is vital to our nation's economic prosperity; and

Whereas, the expansion of the Panama Canal has made it imperative to improve access on the Mississippi River for larger Post-Panamax ships for export and import of goods; and

Whereas, the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the state of Louisiana desire deepening the Mississippi River Ship Channel to fifty feet; and

Whereas. the project is approved and awaiting federal funding; and

Whereas. thirty-one states will receive economic benefits by the enhanced water carrying capacity of the Mississippi River Ship Channel, also known as the gateway to America's Heartland; and

Whereas, the Mississippi River Ship Channel and tributaries currently account for seven hundred fifty billion dollars of the nation's economy and two million four hundred thousand jobs; and

Whereas, each new additional foot of water draft will account for an additional one million dollars in cargo on a vessel. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide adequate funding to the United States Army Corps of Engineers for the completion of the proposed project to deepen the Mississippi River Ship Channel to fifty feet.

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress, the assistant secretary of the Army for Civil Works, the commander of the United States Army Corps of Engineers New Orleans District, and the governor.

POM–96. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to review the definition of abortion and the use of the term abortion for medical purposes of medical records when a woman has a spontaneous miscarriage; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 130

Whereas. a spontaneous miscarriage is the unavoidable and untreatable process of naturally ending a pregnancy before the twentieth week of gestation; and

Whereas, according to national estimates, approximately fifteen to twenty percent of all pregnancies in the United States end in miscarriage; and

Whereas, according to the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, roughly sixty percent of miscarriages occur when an embryo has an abnormal number of chromosomes during fertilization, a problem that happens by chance, not as a result of anything the parents did: and

Whereas, the devastation and grief associated with a miscarriage leave women to feel as though they had done something wrong to cause it; and

Whereas, the trauma is compounded by physicians, hospitals, clinics, health insurers, and other healthcare providers interchangeably using medical terminology such as abortion, spontaneous abortion, missed abortion, inevitable abortion, incomplete abortion, or septic abortion with spontaneous miscarriage; and

Whereas, towards the end of the last century, medical journals and healthcare professionals consciously began using the term spontaneous miscarriage instead of abortion as both an intuitive empathetic response to the stigma of abortion and as a reflection of legal, technological, professional, and social developments relative to women who experience miscarriage: and

Whereas, despite the evolution and clinical clarity of the use of the term spontaneous miscarriage, many women are horrified to find that the medical diagnosis or condition listed in their patient medical record indicates abortion; and

Whereas, although not technically incorrect based on customary and acceptable medical terminology, the use of the term abortion has a widely recognized modern day implication of intentionally causing the death of an unborn child; and

Whereas, charting, coding, and billing systems include Current Procedures Terminology (CPT) codes, International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, 9th revision (ICD–9), diagnosis-related group (DRG) codes, and other diagnosis and procedure codes utilized in the United States healthcare system; and

Whereas, a conscious and collective assessment needs to be done at the highest level of regulatory authority in the United States to provide for definitive and distinctive use of the terms spontaneous miscarriage versus abortion: Therefore, be it Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to review the definition of abortion and the use of the term abortion for purposes of medical records when a woman has a spontaneous miscarriage; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Robert Wallace, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife.

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mary S. McElroy, of Rhode Island, to be United States District Judge for the District of Rhode Island.

Jason K. Pulliam, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

Stephanie A. Gallagher, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Eric Ross Komitee, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Rachel P. Kovner, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Lewis J. Liman, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Martha Maria Pacold, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Mary M. Rowland, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Steven C. Seeger, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

John L. Sinatra, Jr., of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

Mary Kay Vyskocil, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

David Austin Tapp, of Kentucky, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Gary Richard Brown, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Stephanie Dawkins Davis, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Diane Gujarati, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Frank William Volk, of West Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of West Virginia.

Edward W. Felten, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2025.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1915. A bill to require the recording and reporting of communications between the Department of Justice and the White House relating to civil and criminal investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 1916. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit companies that host videos from enabling child predators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1917. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1918. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for summer food service program delivery; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1919. A bill to require certain grantees under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to submit a plan to track discriminatory land use policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1920. A bill to establish jobs programs for long-term unemployed workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1921. A bill to provide that primary care services provided by the National Health Service Corps may include palliative care services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1922. A bill to authorize Federal agencies to establish prize competitions for innovation or adaptation management development relating to coral reef ecosystems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 1923. A bill to require the establishment of a Consumer Price Index for Elderly Consumers to compute cost-of-living increases for Social Security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act and to provide, in the case of elderly beneficiaries under such title, for an annual cost-of-living increase which is not less than 3 percent; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1924. A bill to prevent the purchase of ammunition by prohibited purchasers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 1925. A bill to authorize State opioid response grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions .

By Ms. HARRIS:

S. 1926. A bill to increase access to pre-exposure prophylaxis to reduce the transmission of HIV; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1927. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to association retirement plans and other multiple employer pension benefit plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1928. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the enrollment of retiring individuals in the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HARRIS, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1929. A bill to prohibit the Department of Housing and Urban Development from limiting the eligibility of DACA recipients for certain assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1930. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to direct the Commandant of the Coast Guard to report to Congress on efforts to increase gender diversity in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1931. A bill to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. MCSALLY, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1932. A bill to support water infrastructure in Reclamation States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

S. 1933. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Biometric Identification Transnational Migration Alert Program in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1934. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for persons disabled by treatment under the Veterans Community Care Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CASEY, Ms. SMITH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. COONS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that working families have access to affordable health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1936. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect coverage for screening mammography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1937. A bill to promote merger enforcement and protect competition through adjusting premerger filing fees, and increasing antitrust enforcement resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1938. A bill to provide for grants for States that require fair and impartial police training for law enforcement officers of that State and to incentivize States to enact laws requiring the independent investigation and prosecution of the use of deadly force by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. GARDNER, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1939. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish the Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing Transportation (SMART) Challenge Grant Program to promote technological innovation in our Nation's communities; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SMITH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. REED, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1940. A bill to permit legally married same-sex couples to amend their filing status for tax returns outside the statute of limitations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1941. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 254. A resolution commemorating June 20, 2019, as ''World Refugee Day'' ; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. SMITH):

S. Res. 255. A resolution recognizing June 2019 as ''Immigrant Heritage Month'' , a celebration of the accomplishments and contributions immigrants and their children have made in shaping the history, strengthening the economy, and enriching the culture of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. TESTER):

S. Res. 256. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of June 16 through June 23, 2019, as ''National GI Bill Commemoration Week'' and celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JONES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 257. A resolution designating June 20, 2019, as ''American Eagle Day'' and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 258. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2019 as ''National Brain Tumor Awareness Month'' ; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. Con. Res. 20. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should posthumously award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Harry W. Colmery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 16

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 16, a bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the treatment of core seasonal industries affected by antidumping or countervailing duty investigations, and for other purposes.

S. 20

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 20, a bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes.

S. 27

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 27, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

S. 193

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a

cosponsor of S. 193, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 261

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 261, a bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024, and for other purposes.

S. 286

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 496

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 496, a bill to preserve United States fishing heritage through a national program dedicated to training and assisting the next generation of commercial fishermen, and for other purposes.

S. 510

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 510, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for certain requirements relating to charges for internet, television, and voice services, and for other purposes.

S. 528

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 528, a bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide a lactation room in public buildings, and for other purposes.

S. 546

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion of certain fringe benefit expenses for which a deduction is disallowed in unrelated business taxable income.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 638, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes.

S. 695

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 695, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow parents of eligible military dependent children to establish Military Education Savings Accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 880

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 880, a bill to provide outreach and reporting on comprehensive Alzheimer's disease care planning services furnished under the Medicare program.

S. 931

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 931, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable.

S. 1071

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1071, a bill to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 1083

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1083, a bill to address the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American colonies between 1619 and 1865 and to establish a commission to study and consider a national apology and proposal for reparations for the institution of slavery, its subsequent de jure and de facto racial and economic discrimination against African-Americans, and the impact of these forces on living African-Americans, to make recommendations to the Congress on appropriate remedies, and for other purposes.

S. 1207

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1207, a bill to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Navajo Nation in Utah, and for other purposes.

S. 1243

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1243, a bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to expand enrollment in TSA PreCheck to expedite commercial travel screening and improve airport security.

S. 1394

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1394, a bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

S. 1469

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1469, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interfering in elections with agents of a foreign government.

S. 1764

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1764, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to ensure just and reasonable charges for telephone and advanced communications services in the correctional and detention facilities.

S. 1779

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1779, a bill to repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act.

S. 1822

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1822, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect to the availability of broadband services, and for other purposes.

S. 1830

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1830, a bill to enhance the security of the United States and its allies, and for other purposes.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the sites associated with the life and legacy of the noted American philanthropist and business executive Julius Rosenwald, with a special focus on the Rosenwald Schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1906

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1906, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide financial assistance to eligible entities to provide and coordinate the provision of suicide prevention services for veterans at risk of suicide and veteran families through the award of grants to such entities, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 112

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 112, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States condemns all forms of violence against children globally and recognizes the harmful impacts of violence against children.

AMENDMENT NO. 301

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 301 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 348

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 348 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 357

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 357 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 388

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 388 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 417

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 417 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 421

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 421 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 556

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 556 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 563

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 563 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 568

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 568 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 569

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 569 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 576

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 576 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 592

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 592 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 593

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 593 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 654

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 654 intended

to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 694

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 694 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 702

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 702 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 706

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 706 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 739

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 739 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 789

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 789 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 792

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 792 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 797

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 797 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 1925. A bill to authorize State opioid response grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I am here to continue the important conversation we had on this floor about the ongoing addiction crisis we face in this country. Over the past 2 years, I have come to the floor 57 times to talk about addiction, and usually it has been about opioids and the impact opioids are having—tearing our families apart, devastating our communities. There is certainly an opioid epidemic in this country with prescription drugs, fentanyl, heroin—it is true—but we also have to focus on the fact that we have a broader problem. That is what I am going to talk about today, along with what we can do about it.

Congress has done a lot in the last several years. When looking at what was proposed and what was passed, we put new policies in place at the Federal level to promote better prevention, better treatment programs, and better long-term recovery. We passed legislation to stop some of these deadly drugs from coming into our country. That has helped somewhat. Those legislative initiatives, such as the CARA Act, the 21st Century Cures Act, and the STOP Act, are starting to work.

Over $3 billion of additional funds has been appropriated by this Congress just in the last 3 years alone to ensure that we have the ability to push back against this epidemic. In my home State of Ohio—one of the States hardest hit by this epidemic—we received nearly $140 million from the CARA and Cures grants. It is going toward stuff that is working—evidence-based prevention, innovative approaches to treatment and getting people into treatment, and closing some of the gaps in the continuum of prevention, treatment, and recovery. A lot of people were falling between the cracks. Closing those gaps has a made a big difference in my State. We also equipped our first responders with what they need and the training they need to help push back.

The good news is, these programs are starting to work. Drug overdose deaths are still way too high, but for the first time in 8 years—8 years of increased overdose deaths every year—we are seeing a reduction in overdose deaths.

In my own State of Ohio, we have seen significant progress. We have had a 21-percent drop in our overdose deaths finally after 8 years of increases. This was the biggest drop in the Nation from July 2017 to June of 2018, according to the Centers for Disease Control National Center of Health Statistics. Nationally, again after 8 years of annual increased deaths, we have seen a leveling out—in fact, a very modest downturn. Between 2017 and 2018, overdose deaths fell from 73,000 to 71,000. In all, the overdose rate dropped in 21 States. Overall, there has been only about a 1-percent drop, so it is very modest but a lot better than the alternative we have seen for 8 years, which is increased deaths.

As we begin to turn the tide on the opioid epidemic, I am convinced that we would be doing even better if not for the influx of fentanyl. About 4 or 5 years ago, fentanyl came to our country in a big way—almost entirely from China and almost always through our own U.S. Postal Service, believe it or not—and it has caused all kinds of havoc. It is the deadliest of all the drugs. When you look at overdose deaths, the primary cause now is fentanyl. It is a synthetic drug that is 50 times more powerful than heroin.

We are beginning to push back again, including with our STOP Act, which has now been passed, which requires the post office to begin screening and stopping some of these packages from coming in. We will do a better job in working with China. We have commitments from them, and we hope they will follow through on them.

Even as this limited progress is being made on the opioid front, we have a new, growing danger. I have heard this over the past few years from law enforcement and from providers—from people on the frontlines of the drug epidemic. They are seeing a resurgence of what are called psychostimulants. Mostly it is pure, powerful methamphetamine from Mexico—crystal meth.

In the last couple of months, I have heard about this from the people in the trenches all over Ohio. I have talked to community leaders in Knox County; treatment providers in Southeast Ohio; service providers in Columbus; the ADAMHS Board in Adams, Lawrence, and Scioto Counties; the leadership of

the Hamilton County Heroin Coalition; and community leaders and law enforcement in Butler County and the Dayton area just last week. From all over the State, they all tell me the same thing: We are making some progress now on heroin, and that is good. We are making limited progress on keeping the fentanyl out. But we are spinning our wheels on combating particularly crystal meth, and they are also seeing a resurgence of cocaine—both of which are stimulants, and both of which are causing havoc in these communities, in part because, as a psychostimulant, it leads to more violent behavior.

They are having a devastating impact in my State. According to a 2018 report from Ohio University, these psychostimulants—including meth—were found in just nine overdose deaths in 2010. That number rose to 556 overdose deaths in 2017, which is the most recent data we have. That is an increase of 6,000 percent. That same year, Ohio had more than 1,500 people die of cocaine overdose, which is an almost 140-percent increase from the year before.

This problem isn't isolated to Ohio. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, deaths involving cocaine, crystal meth, and other psychostimulants have increased nationwide. In the more than 70,000 drug overdose deaths in 2017, more than 23,000 or nearly one-third involved cocaine, meth, or both. Just from 2016 to 2017, in that 1 year, death rates involving cocaine and crystal meth increased by approximately 33 percent. Increases occurred across all demographic groups and in all ZIP Codes.

In the case of meth in particular, usage rates have gone up as opioid rates have gone down. I am told by experts that this is for a few reasons. Some meth users initially turned to this drug to manage the heavy crashes that followed prolonged usage of opioids—heroin, fentanyl, and other opioids—and then they became just as addicted to meth as they had been to opioids. Others turns to meth because the drug is stronger and cheaper than other options.

By the way, the days of home chemists and one-pot meth labs in America are largely gone. You probably can remember, 5, 10, 15 years ago, the meth labs in your community. You are not hearing about those now. That is the good thing, but the bad thing is that you are not hearing about them because the stuff coming from Mexico is more powerful and less expensive. The super-labs in Mexico run by the drug cartels are mass-producing this meth. It is powerful, deadly, and low cost. I am told by law enforcement in Columbus, OH, that crystal meth now costs less than marijuana on the streets of Columbus.

Most of this pure crystal meth enters the United States from Mexico in bulk at ports of entry along our southwest border, often hidden in cars and trucks. Our Customs and Border Protection officers, who are already stretched thin by the ongoing migration crisis, don't have the resources to identify these smuggled shipments. The INTERDICT Act, which we passed here, is beginning to help by providing some technology, but, frankly, we need research on better technology, and we need to provide more funding to ensure we can stop this deadly substance by identifying it at the border to keep it from coming in.

According to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the amount of methamphetamine at our ports of entry has soared from about 14,000 pounds in 2012 to 56,000 pounds in 2018. We have also seen a 38-percent increase in methamphetamine trafficking along the southern border just in the 1 year from 2017 to 2018. One troubling measurement is that the number of crystal meth submissions to the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation lab rose from 2,000 in 2015 to over 12,000 in 2018. That is a 500-percent increase in my home State. This is an indication of how much of this is being detained, being found by law enforcement and taken to these labs.

As I heard from folks all across Ohio, we are also seeing meth laced with other drugs, including fentanyl, heroin, and sometimes cocaine. I am told that sometimes the cartels mix these drugs into methamphetamine to lower the cost of the final product, meaning that the users may be consuming dangerous opioids without realizing it. Other traffickers do so because they know that fentanyl is incredibly addictive. You may think it is one thing, but it is really another. Any street drug you use is potentially deadly—remember that.

We still don't have the full picture of how these drugs are being mixed together and sold for consumption. Over the past 2 years, I have seen more reports of individuals in Ohio who used cocaine that, unknown to them, had been mixed with fentanyl. In the last month alone, at least 49 Ohioans in my hometown of Cincinnati, OH, were killed by that deadly combination. It has been hitting our African-American communities particularly hard.

Again, this highlights how the drug cartels sometimes try to hook users by cutting stimulants with addictive, deadly fentanyl, often with lethal outcomes.

The bottom line is, we have to address the broader issue of addiction, not just the issue of individual drugs. We know that crystal meth and cocaine are increasing pretty dramatically. That is why we have to continue our fight against opioid use but also provide more flexibility to our communities. As a result, today I am introducing new legislation designed to address the resurgence of crystal meth and cocaine into our communities.

To date, the grants provided by the 21st Century Cures Act—these are grants that go directly back to the States, and the States determine how they are used in local communities. These are called State opioid response grants. They have been used to increase access to naloxone—a miracle drug that reverses the overdose. They have also been used for longer term addiction treatment and support services for opioids.

For all the good they have done, these grants can't be used effectively to combat the drug crisis beyond opioids, which ignores the new on-the-ground reality of addiction in my State and many others. So the legislation I am introducing today will make a simple change to existing law. It will allow the State opioid response grants to be more flexible so they can be used for whatever the drug addiction problem is on the ground, which will be a little different for every State and, for that matter, every community. In particular, dollars would be able to be used in programs focused on methamphetamine and cocaine treatment and recovery.

We know these existing funds are making a difference. We have to be sure and keep this program going. That is why my legislation will also reauthorize the State opioid response grants program with this flexibility but reauthorize it for 5 years, providing $500 million annually to ensure there is stable funding.

A stable funding stream to these States is absolutely essential to having the predictability and the certainty we need to continue to make progress and to avoid these new drugs coming in and creating more devastation in our communities. It is a simple, commonsense change that will allow State and local organizations the flexibility they need to fight what is quickly becoming a two-front war on addiction.

The fact that we are continuing to see these new types of drugs pop up in Ohio and around the country highlights the reality that this is a fight against addiction. Addiction is a disease. Again, this Congress has done an unprecedented amount of work in this area in the last few years, and I commend us for that, but we have to do more. We have to provide this flexibility. We have to be sure we are focusing on the fight against addiction, not just on individual drugs.

While I am encouraged by the welcomed progress in preventing opioid overdose deaths, we cannot rest on our laurels. The cartels continue to pump new combinations of opioids and stimulants into vulnerable communities, hooking individuals on yet another toxic drug and perpetrating this cycle of addiction. Let's keep our unprecedented bipartisan efforts going in this body. Let's continue to partner with allies, local government and State governments, and with our nonprofits. Let's make sure the resources are there to continue to save lives and restore communities.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. MCSALLY, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1932. A bill to support water infrastructure in Reclamation States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources .

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Drought Resiliency and Water Supply Improvement Act, which Senator CORY GARDNER (R–CO) introduced today. I am the lead Democratic sponsor on the bill, and Senators MARTHA MCSALLY (R–AZ) and KYRSTEN SINEMA (D–AZ) are also original cosponsors.

Drought—increasingly severe and prolonged drought—is a stark reality for California and the West. Climate change presents a triple threat to our water supply:

Higher temperatures causing a dwindling snowpack, increased evaporation and other effects that will reduce our natural storage and runoff. This could decrease flow in the Colorado River by 20% or more by mid-century and as much as 40% by the end of the century.

Longer and more severe droughts, including perhaps as much as an 80% chance of a megadrought of 20 to 50 years' duration in the Colorado Basin during this century.

Although this is more uncertain, the possibility of reduced overall precipitation, perhaps 10–15% less in California's Sierra Nevada mountains within the next 20–30 years.

We must respond to this challenge. The bill we are introducing today does so in three fundamental ways:

It significantly increases funding for an ''all-of-the above'' solution to improve our water supply, including surface and groundwater storage, conveyance, water recycling and desalination;

It reforms the Bureau of Reclamation's outdated project delivery system to more quickly approve and more cost-effectively fund new projects; and

It significantly invests not only in water supply projects, but also in environmental restoration to help imperiled species adapt to climate change as well.

Climate Change and Drought: I would like to say more about the effects of climate change on two critical areas for California: the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and the Colorado River Basin.

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory scientists project that climate change will cause a 54 percent drop in the Sierras' snowpack within the next 20 to 40 years and a 79 percent drop by the end of the century. This change alone could be devastating for California, because we absolutely depend on this snowpack. The Sierra snowpack provides 30% of our water supply and is our biggest reservoir. We need to start now to provide substitute ways for storing precipitation in the Sierras, whether through surface storage, groundwater storage, or improved infrastructure to transport floodwaters to the best recharge areas.

This enhanced storage in its many forms will be helpful not only for water users but also to maintain enough cold water for salmon. Cold water reserves are critical to prevent salmon runs from being wiped out during years of devastating droughts.

The outlook for the Colorado Basin is perhaps even more challenging. The Colorado River provides a critical part of the water supply for 19 million people in southern California, but that water supply is diminishing. Already in 2019 the water demands on the Colorado River exceed average inflows to the river by 1.2 million to 1.5 million acre feet each year.

That is a huge gap, and the Drought Contingency Plan that was just negotiated among the 7 Colorado River Basin states represents just the beginning of efforts needed to close even the existing gap. With climate change, far more needs to be done, especially with warmer temperatures and greatly increased evaporation in the Basin and with the considerable odds of a megadrought of 20 to 50 years' duration.

The bill we are introducing today provides the Colorado River Basin States with the tools to begin investing in a wide range of water supply projects to meet this challenge. I believe this bill will be critical for helping reach agreement in the next round of negotiations for Colorado River drought contingency plans due to be completed by 2026.

Funding Authorizations in the Bill: In response to the water supply challenges presented by climate change, the bill we are introducing today significantly increases funding authorizations for a wide variety of water supply and environmental restoration projects.

The proposed legislation builds on and doubles the 5-year funding authorizations in the 2016 Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation (WIIN) Act. The bill authorizes the following funding over the next 5 years:

$670 million for surface and groundwater storage projects, and supporting conveyance;

$100 million for water recycling projects; and

$60 million for desalination projects.

In addition, the bill authorizes $140 million for environmental restoration and compliance projects. These projects include forest, meadow and watershed restoration projects with water benefits and projects to help restore threatened and endangered species affected by Bureau of Reclamation water projects.

Low-Interest Loans for Water Supply Projects: The bill creates a new loan program at 30-year Treasury rates (currently about 2.6%) for water supply projects known as the Reclamation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (RIFIA). The loans would use existing criteria under the successful WIFIA program (the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act).

The Office of Management and the Budget (OMB) has approved loans of $2.3 billion for WIFIA in fiscal year 2018 backed by appropriations of just over 1% of that amount or $25 million in budget authority. OMB was able to approve loans backed by just 1% of the loan amount because there is a virtually non-existent default rate for water projects. Only 4 in a thousand water infrastructure projects default, based on a study conducted by the Fitch credit rating agency.

Given OMB's experience that Federal outlays need only cover 1% of the loan cost for water projects, the $125 million in authorized Federal spending in the draft bill likely could support $12.5 billion in water project lending authority.

Needless to say, $12.5 billion is a meaningful amount of Federal low-interest lending assistance for new water supply projects. And, because RIFIA is limited to no more than 49 percent of total project costs, that same $125 million in RIFIA budget authority will support no less than $25.5 billion in new water infrastructure investments throughout the west.

Need to Improve Reclamation's Project Delivery System: The bill not only increases funding for drought resiliency projects, it expedites their approvals and assists them more cost-effectively, stretching taxpayer dollars further.

The traditional Bureau of Reclamation model for approving and funding new water supply projects has involved the following:

Reclamation studies new projects in detail, which can take a decade or more for major projects:

Once Reclamation's studies are complete, Congress authorizes projects individually, which can take another 3–5 years or more in many cases; and

Congress then funds 100% of the project construction cost over many years of incremental appropriations, with project sponsors paying back the federal government over 50 years at little to no interest.

One can quickly see that this model can end up taking decades to construct significant new water supply projects. This is especially the case given the limitations of Federal budgets and the increasing cost of major projects in recent years. Given the tremendous challenge posed by climate change to Western water supply, we need a nimbler and more responsive model.

Mike Connor, the Deputy Secretary of the Interior during the Obama Administration, testified in support of a new model during an October 8, 2015 hearing before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Deputy Secretary Connor stated:

> The traditional Reclamation business model, in which feasibility studies, consistent with the 1983 Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Resources Development, are first authorized, funded, and submitted to Congress, and then construction is authorized and funded, does not always address the needs of project sponsors at the State and local levels. Moreover, given budget limitations and the availability of other available financing mechanisms, the

historic federal role in financing water storage projects through the Bureau of Reclamation must be revisited with a greater emphasis on non-federal financing.

Changes to Traditional Model: In response to the concerns articulated by Deputy Secretary Connor and others, the bill we are introducing today, building on the WIIN Act, makes five significant changes to the traditional Reclamation model. These changes expedite project approvals and make more cost-effective use of available federal funding.

1) Congressional authorization no longer required:

First, the bill eliminates the need for Congress to authorize individual projects. It can take 3–5 years for projects to get legislatively approved or longer. In fact, zero new water recycling projects have been authorized since 2009 due to the Federal earmark ban.

While Congressional authorizations are no longer required, Congress retains full veto authority over which projects get built through the appropriations process. Unless Congress approves funding for the study and construction of individual projects, Reclamation cannot proceed with them.

The advantage of the appropriations process as an alternative mechanism for Congressional approval is that it occurs every year. So rather than waiting 3–5 years or longer for Congressional approval under the traditional model, Congress decides each year whether or not to fund proposed projects.

2) Non-Federal funding is required upfront:

Second, the bill no longer requires 100% federal funding upfront as was necessary under the traditional Reclamation model. Instead, the bill allows a maximum of 50% Federal funding for Federally-owned projects, and a maximum of 25% federal funding for non-federal projects that are built by States, water districts, or Indian tribes.

Federal dollars can be stretched further by the partnerships with States and water districts that will be fostered under the bill. For example, the proposed expansion of Los Vaqueros Reservoir in California would be funded 50% by the State of California, which has already conditionally awarded funding, in addition to potentially 10–25% by the federal government and the remaining 25–40% by water users.

Multi-partner projects like the Los Vaqueros expansion will frequently have multiple benefits. For example, much of the State and Federal funding for the Los Vaqueros expansion would go to augment the water supply of wildlife refuges that provide essential water for migratory birds on the Pacific flyway. These benefits would complement the project's water supply benefits for many Bay Area water districts.

3) Feasibility studies are expedited:

Third, for the non-Federal projects authorized by the bill, the federal study process would be significantly expedited, and it does so without waiving any environmental protection requirements. The bill makes clear that federal environmental laws must be fully and strictly followed.

Existing law, however, already addresses study procedures in parallel circumstances when the nonfederal entities are building a project and the federal government is only responsible for a minority of the project cost, no more than 25%. In these circumstances, the Federal government can and should expeditiously approve feasibility and other preliminary studies. There is existing precedent for such projects in the guidelines adopted by the Bureau of Reclamation for feasibility studies for water recycling projects under the Title XVI program. Like all the nonfederal projects in this bill, these water recycling projects are built by non-federal entities with a maximum 25% federal cost-share.

The bill we are introducing today would direct Reclamation to model its feasibility study standards for all nonfederal projects based on the Title XVI example. This will reduce delays in project approval and get these projects built faster.

4) The new loan program is cost-effective:

Fourth, the low-interest loan program created by the bill is an exceptionally cost-effective program. As I mentioned above, OMB has validated that low-interest water project loans need to be backed by Federal appropriations totaling only 1% of the project loan amount.

Federal funding of 1% of the loan amount will typically return 10–25% savings in the repayment cost of the loans for the water districts funding the projects. The total savings can be about 10% for AAA rated districts, and 20–25% for AA-rated districts.

For example, the water users who are supporting the proposed Sites Reservoir in northern California have estimated that the loans authorized by this bill would allow them to pay only $512/acre-foot for water delivered by the project instead of $682/acre-foot. This is a 25% reduction in their costs.

Thus, the Federal government can provide a loan at 1% of the loan amount and save the project sponsors 10–25% of the project cost. That is an exceptionally cost-effective federal investment.

There are at least three significant reasons that the loans are so beneficial for the project sponsors:

The sponsors pay about a 2.6% interest rate on their loans based on today's rates, versus 4% or greater rates for the alternative of municipal bond financing.

The districts would not need to start loan repayments until 5 years after substantial completion of the project, a substantial cost saver.

Loans are for 35 rather than 30 years, lowering annual debt service costs.

Significantly, the loans include all the taxpayer protections from the successful WIFIA and TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act) programs. In particular, the RIFIA loans would be limited to 49% of the project cost, and the federal loans would have senior status in the event of any default. These provisions ensure the taxpayer won't be harmed in any default where the project retains at least 50% of its value, which is extremely likely for ratepayer backed water supply projects.

5) Federal grants and loans work together:

Fifth, the combination of low-interest loans and Federal grants of up to 25% of project costs for non-Federal projects can allow water users to make up the difference where the Federal government is no longer funding 100% of project costs up front. Many rural communities, and in particular agricultural communities, are not able to pay 100% of the cost of new water supply projects.

Under the bill we are introducing today, these communities will still have to provide a significant cost-share for improving their water supplies, and new water projects will have to be cost-effective enough to justify that investment. However, the Federal government can help build the best and most effective projects in increasing drought resiliency by providing assistance through both grants and loans.

Environmental Benefits: The longer and more severe droughts coming with climate change will adversely affect not just farms and cities, but also the natural environment. The bill includes provisions to improve species' drought resiliency as well.

The significant funding authorization of $140 million for environmental restoration can be used to benefit many different species, including fish, migratory birds, and forest species. Some of the authorized uses of this funding include:

Improved habitat for salmon, Delta smelt and other fish species adversely affected by the Bureau of Reclamation's water projects;

Additional water for wildlife refuges hosting migratory birds along the Pacific flyway;

Improved stream gauges, monitoring and science to better understand how to restore species and to operate Reclamation water projects with reduced environmental impacts;

Assistance in implementing water-related settlements with State agencies and state water quality laws; and

Forest, meadow and watershed restoration efforts that improve the quality, timing, or other attributes of runoff to reservoirs or groundwater storage facilities.

I want to say a little more about the new authorization for forest, meadow and watershed restoration projects with water benefits. Wildfire and drought are two of our biggest challenges in California, and we need new tools to respond to them.

There are national forest lands and meadows upstream of many reservoirs

in California that are at serious risk of catastrophic fire.

If treatments of these lands restore healthier ecological conditions, it will improve water runoff into the downstream reservoirs and reduce the risk of large sedimentation dumps into the reservoirs from catastrophic fires.

Restoration of these lands may not be a top priority for the Forest Service because that agency's mission does not emphasize water benefits.

The bill being introduced today would authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to contribute a portion of the cost of these projects. The new funding source will in turn make these multi-benefit projects more likely to be implemented.

I believe it is critical that we develop new tools like this one for reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfires, and improving our drought resiliency.

I and the other cosponsors of today's bill are also looking for additional ways to increase the natural environment's resiliency to droughts in our states. We have circulated language for discussion and potential inclusion in the bill that would provide additional funding for ''natural water storage projects.''

These projects would help restore stream and river channels with natural materials like wetlands. Like many other projects prioritized by the bill, these projects could have multiple benefits, including increased groundwater recharge, improved flood protection, and increased floodplain habitat to benefit salmon and other species.

We look forward to receiving comments on ways to prioritize multi-benefit projects like natural water storage projects as we move forward with the bill.

In addition, the bill makes clear that it must be implemented consistently with all federal environmental laws, including the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Water Act and all other environmental laws. All applicable state laws must also be followed.

Offsets: Finally, the bill includes two provisions offsetting the new spending authorizations within it:

It extends the existing WIIN Act provisions allowing water districts to prepay their outstanding capital debts and convert to indefinite length water supply contracts. These provisions are expected to bring in additional revenue within the 10-year scoring window.

It sets up a process to deauthorize inactive water recycling project authorizations.

Conclusion: California is home to more than 40 million people, but our major state-wide water infrastructure hasn't significantly changed in the past 50 years, when we had only 16 million people.

We must modernize the system or we risk becoming a desert state.

I believe that this bill will place California on a long-term path to drought resiliency. Critically, this means putting in place infrastructure to allow our cities, our farmers, and our natural communities to withstand the severe droughts that we are projected to face due to climate change.

I hope my Western colleagues will join me and the others who have introduced this bill, because drought is a serious threat for all of our states. Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 254—COMMEMORATING JUNE 20, 2019, AS ''WORLD REFUGEE DAY''

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 254

Whereas World Refugee Day is a global day to acknowledge the courage, strength, and determination of women, men, and children who are forced to flee their homes due to persecution;

Whereas, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (referred to in this preamble as ''UNHCR'') and the Refugee Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-212), a refugee is someone who—

(1) is outside of the country of his or her nationality; and

(2) is unable or unwilling to return because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a particular social group;

Whereas according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—

(1) there are more than 70,800,000 displaced people worldwide, the worst displacement crisis in global history, including 25,900,000 refugees, more than 41,300,000 internally displaced people, and 3,500,000 asylum seekers;

(2) the refugee population under UNHCR's mandate has nearly doubled since 2012;

(3) 67 percent of the world's refugees come from just 5 countries: Syria, Afghanistan, South Sudan, Burma, and Somalia;

(4) children account for about ½ of the refugee population in the world, millions of whom are unable to access basic services including education;

(5) 13,600,000 individuals were newly displaced due to conflict or persecution in 2018, including 10,800,000 internally displaced persons and 2,800,000 refugees and asylum seekers, an average of 37,000 people per day;

(6) more than ½ of Syrians lived in displacement in 2018, either displaced across international borders or within their own country;

(7) for the fourth consecutive year, Lebanon hosted the largest number of refugees relative to its population, where 1 in 6 people are refugees;

(8) more than 1,400,000 refugees were in need of resettlement to a third country in 2018; and

(9) 25 countries admitted 92,400 refugees for resettlement in 2018;

Whereas refugee children are 5 times more likely to be out of school than nonrefugee children;

Whereas refugees who are women and children are often at greater risk of violence, human trafficking, exploitation, and gender-based violence;

Whereas the United States resettlement program is a life-saving solution critical to global humanitarian efforts, which serves to strengthen global security, advance United States foreign policy goals, and support regional host countries, while assisting individuals and families in need;

Whereas, during the first 6 months of fiscal year 2019, the United States welcomed 12,155 refugees into the country, which is fewer than 50 percent of the administration's refugee admissions goal of 30,000 refugees;

Whereas, at this pace, the United States may not meet its fiscal year 2019 refugee admissions goal;

Whereas refugees are the most vetted traveler to enter the United States and are subject to extensive screening checks, including in person interviews, biometric data checks, and multiple interagency checks;

Whereas refugees are major contributors to local economies, pay an average of $21,000 more in taxes than they receive in benefits, and revitalize cities and towns by offsetting population decline and boosting economic growth throughout the country by opening businesses, paying taxes, and buying homes; and

Whereas several industries rely heavily on refugee workers to support their economic stability, and low rates of arrivals of refugees, especially in towns that rely on refugee populations to revitalize their industries, has had serious impacts on economic growth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the bipartisan commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of the millions of refugees, including the education of refugee children and displaced persons who flee war, persecution, or torture in search of peace, hope, and freedom;

(2) recognizes those individuals who have risked their lives working individually and for nongovernmental organizations and international agencies, such as UNHCR, to provide life-saving assistance and protection for people displaced by conflicts around the world;

(3) underscores the importance of the United States refugee resettlement program as a critical tool for United States global leadership—

(A) to leverage foreign policy;

(B) to strengthen national and regional security; and

(C) to demonstrate international support of refugees;

(4) calls upon the United States Government—

(A) to continue providing robust funding for refugee protection overseas and resettlement in the United States;

(B) to uphold its international leadership role in responding to displacement crises with humanitarian assistance and protection of the most vulnerable populations;

(C) to work in partnership with the international community to find solutions to existing conflicts and prevent new conflicts from beginning;

(D) to alleviate the burden placed on frontline refugee host countries, such as the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the People's Republic of Bangladesh, and the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, that absorb the majority of the world's refugees

through humanitarian and development support;

(E) to meet the challenges of the worst refugee crisis in recorded history by increasing the number of refugees welcomed to and resettled in the United States to not fewer than 30,000 refugees during fiscal year 2019 and not fewer than 95,000 refugees during fiscal year 2020; and

(F) to reaffirm its long-standing tradition of resettling the most vulnerable refugees, regardless of their country of origin or religious beliefs; and

(5) reaffirms the goals of World Refugee Day and reiterates the strong commitment to protect the millions of refugees who live without material, social, or legal protections.

SENATE RESOLUTION 255—RECOGNIZING JUNE 2019 AS ''IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH'', A CELEBRATION OF THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS IMMIGRANTS AND THEIR CHILDREN HAVE MADE IN SHAPING THE HISTORY, STRENGTHENING THE ECONOMY, AND ENRICHING THE CULTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. SMITH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 255

Whereas the United States has always been a Nation of immigrants, and throughout the history of the United States, immigrants and their children from around the world have kept the workforce in the United States vibrant and businesses in the United States on the cutting edge, and helped to build the greatest economic engine in the world;

Whereas the entrepreneurial drive and spirit of the United States is built on a diversity of origins;

Whereas the American dream first drew people to the United States and continues to drive business in the United States;

Whereas the success of the United States is a result of the many distinct experiences of the people of the United States, not in spite of it;

Whereas, as a Nation of immigrants, we must remember the generations of pioneers that helped lay the railroads and build cities, develop new industries, and fuel innovation and the exchange of ideas;

Whereas immigrants start more than a quarter of all new businesses in the United States, and immigrants and their children start more than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies;

Whereas these businesses collectively employ tens of millions of people in the United States and generate more than $5,500,000,000,000 in annual revenue;

Whereas immigrants enhance the productive capacity of the United States economy and contribute approximately $2,000,000,000,000, or about 10 percent of annual gross domestic product of the United States;

Whereas immigrants in the United States contribute greatly to advances in technology and sciences;

Whereas 16 percent of all employed college graduates and 54.5 percent of individuals with a Ph.D. working in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math are immigrants;

Whereas, between 2006 and 2012, 44 percent of new tech startups in Silicon Valley, widely known as the international hub for technological development and innovation, had at least 1 immigrant founder;

Whereas immigrants in the United States plant, cultivate, and harvest the rich diversity of agriculture products available today from the farmlands of the United States;

Whereas each immigrant farm employee supports 2 to 3 full-time jobs in processing, transportation, and retail;

Whereas immigrants involved in agricultural production aid in the food security and independence of the United States;

Whereas the work of immigrants has directly enriched the culture of the United States by influencing the performing arts from Broadway to Hollywood, as well as academia, art, music, literature, media, fashion, cuisine, customs, and cultural celebrations enjoyed across the United States;

Whereas generations of immigrants have come to the United States from all corners of the world, and many immigrants tirelessly fought for the independence of the United States, defending the ideals of the country;

Whereas more than 30,000 lawful permanent residents are serving in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas, since 2002, more than 102,000 men and women, including individuals serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, South Korea, Germany, Japan, and elsewhere, have become citizens while serving in the Armed Forces;

Whereas Congress represents a rich diversity of communities across the United States and works closely with a variety of diaspora leaders from more than 60 ethnic caucuses to ensure that the voices of United States citizens from all backgrounds are heard; and

Whereas the United States was founded on the universal promise that we are all created equal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes June 2019 as ''Immigrant Heritage Month'' in honor of the accomplishments and role of immigrants and their children in shaping the history and culture of the United States;

(2) pledges to celebrate immigrant contributions to, and immigrant heritage in, each State;

(3) welcomes immigrants and their children to find their place in the vibrant, multiethnic, and integrated society of the United States; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to always remember the immigrant roots of the United States and to commemorate the immigrant communities that continue to move the country forward.

SENATE RESOLUTION 256—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF JUNE 16 THROUGH JUNE 23, 2019, AS ''NATIONAL GI BILL COMMEMORATION WEEK'' AND CELEBRATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

S. RES. 256

Whereas, on July 28, 1943, in seeking a solution to integrate returning members of the Armed Forces into civilian life, President Franklin D. Roosevelt called for a comprehensive set of veterans benefits during a fireside chat saying, ''While concentrating on military victory, we are not neglecting the planning of the things to come . . . . Among many other things we are, today, laying plans for the return to civilian life of our gallant men and women in the Armed Services.'';

Whereas, on June 22, 1944, in demonstration of the full support of the United States for the transition of members of the Armed Forces to civilian life, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed into law the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 284, chapter 268), more commonly known as the ''G.I. Bill of Rights'';

Whereas the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 was the culmination of the tireless work and advocacy of veteran service organizations and Members of Congress;

Whereas the Act made immediate financial support, transformative educational benefits, and home loan guarantees available to the 16,000,000 veterans who served in the Armed Forces during World War II;

Whereas the Act helped approximately 7,800,000 veterans enroll in post-secondary education or training, helped to democratize higher education in the United States, and caused total post-secondary education enrollment to grow exponentially from 1,676,856 in 1945, with veterans accounting for 5.2 percent of total post-secondary education enrollment, to 2,338,226 in 1947, with veterans accounting for 49.2 percent of the total;

Whereas the Act contributed approximately 450,000 engineers, 240,000 accountants, 238,000 teachers, 91,000 scientists, 67,000 doctors, 122,000 dentists, 17,000 writers and editors, and thousands of other professionals to the workforce of the United States and expanded the middle class more than at any other point in the history of the United States;

Whereas the Act expressed the duty, responsibility, and desire of a grateful United States to see to it that those who served on active duty in the Armed Forces are afforded every opportunity to become disciplined forces for prosperity and progress in the United States through economic opportunity and investment;

Whereas Congress passed subsequent Acts to provide educational assistance to new generations of veterans, including the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–358), the Post-Vietnam Era Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1977 (title IV of Public Law 94–502), the Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1984 (title VII of Public Law 98–525), the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008 (title V of Public Law 110–252), and the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2017 (Public Law 115–48);

Whereas, since the signing of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the Department of Veterans Affairs has paid approximately $400,000,000,000 in educational assistance to approximately 25,000,000 veterans and their loved ones who continue to excel academically in post-secondary education;

Whereas the Act created the Department of Veterans Affairs Home Loan Guarantee program, which, since 1944, has provided a pathway for approximately 24,000,000 veterans to purchase a home guaranteed by the Department, the majority of which are purchased with no down payment;

Whereas the Act improved health care opportunities for veterans by transferring medical facilities from the Army and the Navy and providing funding for hospitals of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

Whereas this combination of opportunities changed the social and economic fabric of the United States for the better, with a 1988 report from the Subcommittee on Education

and Health of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress concluding that for every $1 the United States invested pursuant to the Act, $6.90 was returned in growth to the economy of the United States;

Whereas 1,262 Members of Congress served in the Armed Forces on or after June 22, 1944, and, therefore, many Members of Congress directly benefitted from the enactment of the Act;

Whereas June 22, 2019, is the 75th anniversary of the date on which President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Act into law; and

Whereas the week of June 16 through June 23, 2019, is an appropriate week to designate as ''National GI Bill Commemoration Week'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses support for the designation of the week of June 16 through June 23, 2019, as ''National GI Bill Commemoration Week'';

(2) honors the achievements of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 284, chapter 268), more commonly known as the ''G.I. Bill of Rights'', in democratizing higher education, increasing home ownership, establishing greater citizenship through economic empowerment, and empowering a generation that would serve for decades to guide the transformation of the United States into a global force for good;

(3) considers the veterans benefitting from the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 on the 75th anniversary of its enactment—

(A) to be equal to the challenge of creating a lasting prosperity for the United States as their forebears; and

(B) to have the opportunity to become the heirs to the Greatest Generation;

(4) affirms the responsibility of Congress to be faithful stewards of educational assistance provided under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that such assistance endures as an honorable investment of public dollars; and

(5) encourages all people of the United States to celebrate June 22, 2019, as the 75th anniversary of the signing of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

SENATE RESOLUTION 257—DESIGNATING JUNE 20, 2019, AS ''AMERICAN EAGLE DAY'' AND CELEBRATING THE RECOVERY AND RESTORATION OF THE BALD EAGLE, THE NATIONAL SYMBOL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JONES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 257

Whereas the bald eagle was chosen as the central image of the Great Seal of the United States on June 20, 1782, by the Founding Fathers at the Congress of the Confederation;

Whereas the bald eagle is widely known as the living national symbol of the United States and for many generations has represented values, such as—

(1) freedom;
(2) democracy;
(3) courage;
(4) strength;
(5) spirit;
(6) independence;
(7) justice; and
(8) excellence;

Whereas the bald eagle is unique to North America and cannot be found naturally in any other part of the world, which was one of the primary reasons the Founding Fathers selected the bald eagle to symbolize the Government of the United States;

Whereas the bald eagle is the central image used in the official logos of many branches and departments of the Federal Government, including—

(1) the Executive Office of the President;
(2) Congress;
(3) the Supreme Court of the United States;
(4) the Department of Defense;
(5) the Department of the Treasury;
(6) the Department of Justice;
(7) the Department of State;
(8) the Department of Commerce;
(9) the Department of Homeland Security;
(10) the Department of Veterans Affairs;
(11) the Department of Labor;
(12) the Department of Health and Human Services;
(13) the Department of Energy;
(14) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;
(15) the Central Intelligence Agency; and
(16) the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the spirit of freedom and the sovereignty of the United States;

Whereas the image and symbolism of the bald eagle has—

(1) played a significant role in art, music, literature, architecture, commerce, education, and culture in the United States; and

(2) appeared on United States stamps, currency, and coinage;

Whereas the bald eagle was endangered and facing possible extinction in the lower 48 States but has made a gradual and encouraging comeback to the land, waterways, and skies of the United States;

Whereas the dramatic recovery of the national bird of the United States is an endangered species success story and an inspirational example to other environmental, natural resource, and wildlife conservation efforts worldwide;

Whereas, in 1940, noting that the bald eagle was threatened with extinction, Congress passed the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the ''Bald Eagle Protection Act'') (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), which prohibited killing, selling, or possessing the species, and a 1962 amendment expanded protection to the golden eagle;

Whereas, by 1963, there were only an estimated 417 nesting pairs of bald eagles remaining in the lower 48 States, with loss of habitat, poaching, and the use of pesticides and other environmental contaminants contributing to the near demise of the national bird of the United States;

Whereas, in 1967, the bald eagle was officially declared an endangered species under Public Law 89–669 (80 Stat. 926) (commonly known as the ''Endangered Species Preservation Act of 1966'') in areas in the United States south of the 40th parallel due to the dramatic decline in the population of the bald eagle in the lower 48 States;

Whereas the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) was enacted in 1973, and in 1978, the bald eagle was listed as an endangered species throughout the lower 48 States, except in the States of Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin, in which the bald eagle was listed as a threatened species;

Whereas, in July 1995, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service announced that in the lower 48 States, the bald eagle had recovered sufficiently to change the status of the species from endangered to threatened;

Whereas, by 2007, bald eagles residing in the lower 48 States had rebounded to approximately 11,000 pairs;

Whereas, on June 28, 2007, the Secretary the Interior and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service removed the bald eagle from protection under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), but the bald eagle continues to be protected under the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the ''Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act'') (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.), section 42 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Lacey Act''), and the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.);

Whereas Challenger, the trained, educational bald eagle of the American Eagle Foundation in Pigeon Forge, Tennessee, was invited by the Secretary of the Interior to perform a free-flight demonstration during the official bald eagle delisting ceremony held at the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, District of Columbia;

Whereas experts and population growth charts estimate that the bald eagle population could reach 15,000 pairs, even though a physical count has not been conducted by State and Federal wildlife agencies since 2007;

Whereas caring and concerned agencies, corporations, organizations, and people of the United States representing Federal and State governments and the private sector passionately and resourcefully banded together, determined to save and protect the national bird of the United States;

Whereas the recovery of the bald eagle population in the United States was largely accomplished through—

(1) the dedicated and vigilant efforts of Federal and State wildlife agencies and nonprofit organizations, such as the American Eagle Foundation;
(2) public education;
(3) captive breeding and release programs;
(4) hacking and release programs; and
(5) the translocation of bald eagles from places in the United States with dense bald eagle populations to suitable locations in the lower 48 States that had suffered a decrease in bald eagle populations;

Whereas various nonprofit organizations, such as the Southeastern Raptor Center at Auburn University in the State of Alabama, contribute to the continuing recovery of the bald eagle through rehabilitation and educational efforts;

Whereas the bald eagle might have been lost permanently if not for dedicated conservation efforts and strict protection laws such as—

(1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);
(2) the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the ''Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act'') (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.);
(3) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);
(4) section 42 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Lacey Act''); and
(5) the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.); and

Whereas the sustained recovery of the bald eagle population will require the continuation of recovery, management, education, and public awareness programs to ensure that the population numbers and habitat of the bald eagle remain healthy and secure for generations to come: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 20, 2019, as ''American Eagle Day'';

(2) applauds the issuance of bald eagle commemorative coins by the Secretary of the Treasury to generate critical funds for the protection of the bald eagle; and

(3) encourages—

(A) educational entities, organizations, businesses, conservation groups, and government agencies with a shared interest in conserving endangered species to collaborate

and develop educational tools for use in the public schools of the United States; and

(B) the people of the United States to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 258—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 2019 AS ''NATIONAL BRAIN TUMOR AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 258

Whereas an estimated 86,970 new cases of primary brain tumors are expected to be diagnosed in the United States during calendar year 2019;

Whereas pediatric brain tumors are the leading cause of death from cancer in children under the age of 19;

Whereas the average survival rate in the United States for all malignant brain tumor patients is only 35 percent;

Whereas, in 2019, an estimated 16,830 people in the United States will die as a result of a malignant brain tumor;

Whereas brain tumors may be malignant or benign, but can be life-threatening in either case;

Whereas nearly 700,000 people in the United States are currently living with a brain tumor;

Whereas treatment of brain tumors is complicated by the fact that there are more than 130 different types of brain tumors;

Whereas the treatment and removal of brain tumors present significant challenges due to the uniquely complex and fragile nature of the brain;

Whereas brain tumors affect the primary organ in the human body that controls not only cognitive ability, but the actions of every other organ and limb in the body, leading to brain tumors being described as a disease that affects the whole individual;

Whereas brain tumor research is supported by a number of private, nonprofit research foundations and by Federal medical research institutions;

Whereas basic research may fuel advancements and development of new treatments for brain tumors;

Whereas obstacles to the development of new treatments for brain tumors remain, and there are limited strategies for the screening or early detection of brain tumors;

Whereas, despite the high number of individuals diagnosed with a brain tumor every year and the devastating prognoses for such individuals, only 5 drugs and 1 medical device are approved by the Food and Drug Administration to treat brain tumors;

Whereas the mortality rates associated with brain tumors have changed little during the past 30 years;

Whereas there is a need for greater public awareness of brain tumors, including the difficulties associated with research on these tumors and the opportunities for advances in brain tumor research and treatment; and

Whereas May 2019, during which brain tumor advocates nationwide unite in awareness, outreach, and advocacy activities, is an appropriate month to recognize as ''National Brain Tumor Awareness Month'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 2019 as ''National Brain Tumor Awareness Month'';

(2) encourages increased public awareness of brain tumors to honor those individuals who have lost their lives to this devastating disease or currently live with a brain tumor diagnosis;

(3) supports efforts to develop better treatments for brain tumors that will improve the quality of life and the long-term prognoses of those individuals diagnosed with a brain tumor;

(4) expresses its support for those individuals who are battling brain tumors, as well as the families, friends, and caregivers of those individuals; and

(5) urges a collaborative approach to brain tumor research, which is a promising means of advancing understanding of, and treatment for, brain tumors.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 20—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD POSTHUMOUSLY AWARD THE PRESIDENTIAL MEDAL OF FREEDOM TO HARRY W. COLMERY

Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 20

Whereas the life of Harry W. Colmery of Topeka, Kansas, was marked by service to the United States and its citizens;

Whereas in 1916, Harry Colmery earned a degree in law from the University of Pittsburgh and successfully argued 2 significant cases before the Supreme Court of the United States;

Whereas during World War I, Harry Colmery joined the Army Air Service, serving as a first lieutenant during the early stages of military aviation;

Whereas after World War I, Harry Colmery actively contributed to the growth of the newly formed American Legion and went on to hold several offices in the Legion and was elected National Commander in 1936;

Whereas in 1943, the United States faced the return from World War II of what was to become an active duty force of 15,000,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines;

Whereas Harry Colmery spearheaded the efforts of the American Legion to develop legislation to ensure that these individuals, who had fought for the democratic ideals of the United States and to preserve freedom, could fully participate in all of the opportunities the United States provided;

Whereas in December 1943, during an emergency meeting of the American Legion leadership, Harry Colmery initially drafted the legislation that became the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, also known as the GI Bill of Rights;

Whereas the GI Bill of Rights is credited by veterans' service organizations, economists, and historians as the engine that transformed the postwar United States into a more egalitarian, prosperous, and enlightened Nation poised to lead the world into the 21st century;

Whereas since its enactment, the GI Bill of Rights has provided education or training for approximately 7,800,000 individuals, including 2,200,000 in college, 3,400,000 in other schools, 1,400,000 in vocational education, and 690,000 in farm training;

Whereas 2,100,000 World War II veterans purchased homes through the GI Bill;

Whereas the initial GI Bill has provided education and training to over 800,000 professionals that serve the Nation in specific career fields, including 450,000 engineers, 238,000 teachers, 91,000 scientists, 67,000 doctors, and 22,000 dentists;

Whereas in 1945, President Truman established the Presidential Medal of Freedom to recognize notable service during the war, and in 1963, President Kennedy reinstated the medal to honor the achievement of civilians during peacetime;

Whereas pursuant to Executive Order 11085 (27 Fed. Reg. 1759), the President may award the Medal of Freedom to any person who has made an especially meritorious contribution to—

(1) the security or national interest of the United States;

(2) world peace; or

(3) other significant public or private endeavors; and

Whereas Harry Colmery, noted for his service in the military, in the legal sector, and on behalf of the veterans of the Nation, meets the criteria established for the Presidential Medal of Freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President should posthumously award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Harry W. Colmery of Topeka, Kansas.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 803. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 804. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 805. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 806. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 807. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 808. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 809. Mr. ROMNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 810. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 811. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 812. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 813. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 814. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 815. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 816. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 817. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 818. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 819. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 820. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 821. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 822. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 823. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 824. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 825. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 826. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 827. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 828. Ms. MCSALLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 829. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 830. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 831. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 832. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 833. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 834. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 835. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 836. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 837. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 838. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 839. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 840. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 841. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 803. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS FOR ACQUISITION OF A TRANSMISSION ELECTRON MICROSCOPE.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR ACQUISITION OF A TRANSMISSION ELECTRON MICROSCOPE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2020 by section 201 for acquisition of a Transmission Electron Microscope is hereby increased by $5,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for Defense Research Sciences (PE 0601102A) for transmission electron microscopy (TEM) use in advanced analyses of materials for biomedical research, micro- and nano-electronics research, advanced manufacturing and materials research and development, superconductivity, and for other purposes.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2020 by section 201 for AF RDT&E is hereby decreased by $5,000,000 for Future Advanced Weapon Analysis & Programs (PE 0604200F).

SA 804. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following:

Subtitle I—Fair Chance Act

SEC. 1091. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019'' or the ''Fair Chance Act''.

SEC. 1092. PROHIBITION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES PRIOR TO CONDITIONAL OFFER FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart H of part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''CHAPTER 92—PROHIBITION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES PRIOR TO CONDITIONAL OFFER

''Sec.
''9201. Definitions.
''9202. Limitations on requests for criminal history record information.
''9203. Agency policies; complaint procedures.
''9204. Adverse action.
''9205. Procedures.
''9206. Rules of construction.

''§ 9201. Definitions

''In this chapter—

''(1) the term 'agency' means 'Executive agency' as such term is defined in section 105 and includes—

''(A) the United States Postal Service and the Postal Regulatory Commission; and

''(B) the Executive Office of the President;

''(2) the term 'appointing authority' means an employee in the executive branch of the Government of the United States that has authority to make appointments to positions in the civil service;

''(3) the term 'conditional offer' means an offer of employment in a position in the civil service that is conditioned upon the results of a criminal history inquiry;

''(4) the term 'criminal history record information'—

''(A) except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), has the meaning given the term in section 9101(a);

''(B) includes any information described in the first sentence of section 9101(a)(2) that has been sealed or expunged pursuant to law; and

''(C) includes information collected by a criminal justice agency, relating to an act or alleged act of juvenile delinquency, that is analogous to criminal history record information (including such information that has been sealed or expunged pursuant to law); and

''(5) the term 'suspension' has the meaning given the term in section 7501.

''§ 9202. Limitations on requests for criminal history record information

''(a) INQUIRIES PRIOR TO CONDITIONAL OFFER.—Except as provided in subsections

(b) and (c), an employee of an agency may not request, in oral or written form (including through the Declaration for Federal Employment (Office of Personnel Management Optional Form 306) or any similar successor form, the USAJOBS internet website, or any other electronic means) that an applicant for an appointment to a position in the civil service disclose criminal history record information regarding the applicant before the appointing authority extends a conditional offer to the applicant.

''(b) OTHERWISE REQUIRED BY LAW.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to an applicant for a position in the civil service if consideration of criminal history record information prior to a conditional offer with respect to the position is otherwise required by law.

''(c) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to an applicant for an appointment to a position—

''(A) that requires a determination of eligibility described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of section 9101(b)(1)(A);

''(B) as a Federal law enforcement officer (as defined in section 115(c) of title 18); or

''(C) identified by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management in the regulations issued under paragraph (2).

''(2) REGULATIONS.—

''(A) ISSUANCE.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall issue regulations identifying additional positions with respect to which the prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply, giving due consideration to positions that involve interaction with minors, access to sensitive information, or managing financial transactions.

''(B) COMPLIANCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS.—The regulations issued under subparagraph (A) shall—

''(i) be consistent with, and in no way supersede, restrict, or limit the application of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) or other relevant Federal civil rights laws; and

''(ii) ensure that all hiring activities conducted pursuant to the regulations are conducted in a manner consistent with relevant Federal civil rights laws.

''§ 9203. Agency policies; complaint procedures

''The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

''(1) develop, implement, and publish a policy to assist employees of agencies in complying with section 9202 and the regulations issued pursuant to such section; and

''(2) establish and publish procedures under which an applicant for an appointment to a position in the civil service may submit a complaint, or any other information, relating to compliance by an employee of an agency with section 9202.

''§ 9204. Adverse action

''(a) FIRST VIOLATION.—If the Director of the Office of Personnel Management determines, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing on the record, that an employee of an agency has violated section 9202, the Director shall—

''(1) issue to the employee a written warning that includes a description of the violation and the additional penalties that may apply for subsequent violations; and

''(2) file such warning in the employee's official personnel record file.

''(b) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—If the Director of the Office of Personnel Management determines, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing on the record, that an employee that was subject to subsection (a) has committed a subsequent violation of section 9202, the Director may take the following action:

''(1) For a second violation, suspension of the employee for a period of not more than 7 days.

''(2) For a third violation, suspension of the employee for a period of more than 7 days.

''(3) For a fourth violation—

''(A) suspension of the employee for a period of more than 7 days; and

''(B) a civil penalty against the employee in an amount that is not more than $250.

''(4) For a fifth violation—

''(A) suspension of the employee for a period of more than 7 days; and

''(B) a civil penalty against the employee in an amount that is not more than $500.

''(5) For any subsequent violation—

''(A) suspension of the employee for a period of more than 7 days; and

''(B) a civil penalty against the employee in an amount that is not more than $1,000.

''§ 9205. Procedures

''(a) APPEALS.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall by rule establish procedures providing for an appeal from any adverse action taken under section 9204 by not later than 30 days after the date of the action.

''(b) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS.—An adverse action taken under section 9204 (including a determination in an appeal from such an action under subsection (a) of this section) shall not be subject to—

''(1) the procedures under chapter 75; or

''(2) except as provided in subsection (a) of this section, appeal or judicial review.

''§ 9206. Rules of construction

''Nothing in this chapter may be construed to—

''(1) authorize any officer or employee of an agency to request the disclosure of information described under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 9201(4); or

''(2) create a private right of action for any person.''.

(b) REGULATIONS; EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out chapter 92 of title 5, United States Code (as added by this subtitle).

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 9202 of title 5, United States Code (as added by this subtitle), shall take effect on the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 91 the following:

''92. Prohibition on criminal history inquiries prior to conditional offer ..... 9201''.

(d) APPLICATION TO LEGISLATIVE BRANCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 102(a) (2 U.S.C. 1302(a)), by adding at the end the following:

''(12) Section 9202 of title 5, United States Code.'';

(B) by redesignating section 207 (2 U.S.C. 1317) as section 208; and

(C) by inserting after section 206 (2 U.S.C. 1316) the following new section:

''SEC. 207. RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS RELATING TO CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'agency', 'criminal history record information', and 'suspension' have the meanings given the terms in section 9201 of title 5, United States Code, except as otherwise modified by this section.

''(b) RESTRICTIONS ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an employee of an employing office may not request that an applicant for employment as a covered employee disclose criminal history record information if the request would be prohibited under section 9202 of title 5, United States Code, if made by an employee of an agency.

''(B) CONDITIONAL OFFER.—For purposes of applying that section 9202 under subparagraph (A), a reference in that section 9202 to a conditional offer shall be considered to be an offer of employment as a covered employee that is conditioned upon the results of a criminal history inquiry.

''(2) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—The provisions of section 9206 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to employing offices, consistent with regulations issued under subsection (d).

''(c) REMEDY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The remedy for a violation of subsection (b)(1) shall be such remedy as would be appropriate if awarded under section 9204 of title 5, United States Code, if the violation had been committed by an employee of an agency, consistent with regulations issued under subsection (d), except that the reference in that section to a suspension shall be considered to be a suspension with the level of compensation provided for a covered employee who is taking unpaid leave under section 202.

''(2) PROCESS FOR OBTAINING RELIEF.—An applicant for employment as a covered employee who alleges a violation of subsection (b)(1) may rely on the provisions of title IV (other than section 407 or 408, or a provision of this title that permits a person to obtain a civil action or judicial review), consistent with regulations issued under subsection (d).

''(d) REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT SECTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019, the Board shall, pursuant to section 304, issue regulations to implement this section.

''(2) PARALLEL WITH AGENCY REGULATIONS.—The regulations issued under paragraph (1) shall be the same as substantive regulations issued by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under section 1092(b)(1) of the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019 to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsections (a) through (c) except to the extent that the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section.

''(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 102(a)(12) and subsections (a) through (c) shall take effect on the date on which section 9202 of title 5, United States Code, applies with respect to agencies.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–1; 109 Stat. 3) is amended—

(i) by redesignating the item relating to section 207 as the item relating to section 208; and

(ii) by inserting after the item relating to section 206 the following new item:

''Sec. 207. Rights and protections relating to criminal history inquiries.''.

(B) Section 62(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''or 207'' and inserting ''207, or 208''.

(e) APPLICATION TO JUDICIAL BRANCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 604 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) RESTRICTIONS ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the terms 'agency' and 'criminal history record information' have the meanings given those terms in section 9201 of title 5;

''(B) the term 'covered employee' means an employee of the judicial branch of the United States Government, other than—

''(i) any judge or justice who is entitled to hold office during good behavior;

''(ii) a United States magistrate judge; or

''(iii) a bankruptcy judge; and

''(C) the term 'employing office' means any office or entity of the judicial branch of the United States Government that employs covered employees.

''(2) RESTRICTION.—A covered employee may not request that an applicant for employment as a covered employee disclose criminal history record information if the request would be prohibited under section 9202 of title 5 if made by an employee of an agency.

''(3) EMPLOYING OFFICE POLICIES; COMPLAINT PROCEDURE.—The provisions of sections 9203 and 9206 of title 5 shall apply to employing offices and to applicants for employment as covered employees, consistent with regulations issued by the Director to implement this subsection.

''(4) ADVERSE ACTION.—

''(A) ADVERSE ACTION.—The Director may take such adverse action with respect to a covered employee who violates paragraph (2) as would be appropriate under section 9204 of title 5 if the violation had been committed by an employee of an agency.

''(B) APPEALS.—The Director shall by rule establish procedures providing for an appeal from any adverse action taken under subparagraph (A) by not later than 30 days after the date of the action.

''(C) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an adverse action taken under subparagraph (A) (including a determination in an appeal from such an action under subparagraph (B)) shall not be subject to appeal or judicial review.

''(5) REGULATIONS TO BE ISSUED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019, the Director shall issue regulations to implement this subsection.

''(B) PARALLEL WITH AGENCY REGULATIONS.—The regulations issued under subparagraph (A) shall be the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under section 1092(b)(1) of the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019 except to the extent that the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this subsection.

''(6) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraphs (1) through (4) shall take effect on the date on which section 9202 of title 5 applies with respect to agencies.''.

SEC. 1093. PROHIBITION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES BY CONTRACTORS PRIOR TO CONDITIONAL OFFER.

(a) CIVILIAN AGENCY CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 4714. Prohibition on criminal history inquiries by contractors prior to conditional offer

''(a) LIMITATION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), an executive agency—

''(A) may not require that an individual or sole proprietor who submits a bid for a contract to disclose criminal history record information regarding that individual or sole proprietor before determining the apparent awardee; and

''(B) shall require, as a condition of receiving a Federal contract and receiving payments under such contract that the contractor may not verbally, or through written form, request the disclosure of criminal history record information regarding an applicant for a position related to work under such contract before the contractor extends a conditional offer to the applicant.

''(2) OTHERWISE REQUIRED BY LAW.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to a contract if consideration of criminal history record information prior to a conditional offer with respect to the position is otherwise required by law.

''(3) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to—

''(i) a contract that requires an individual hired under the contract to access classified information or to have sensitive law enforcement or national security duties; or

''(ii) a position that the Administrator of General Services identifies under the regulations issued under subparagraph (B).

''(B) REGULATIONS.—

''(i) ISSUANCE.—Not later than 16 months after the date of enactment of the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019, the Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall issue regulations identifying additional positions with respect to which the prohibition under paragraph (1) shall not apply, giving due consideration to positions that involve interaction with minors, access to sensitive information, or managing financial transactions.

''(ii) COMPLIANCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS.—The regulations issued under clause (i) shall—

''(I) be consistent with, and in no way supersede, restrict, or limit the application of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) or other relevant Federal civil rights laws; and

''(II) ensure that all hiring activities conducted pursuant to the regulations are conducted in a manner consistent with relevant Federal civil rights laws.

''(b) COMPLAINT PROCEDURES.—The Administrator of General Services shall establish and publish procedures under which an applicant for a position with a Federal contractor may submit to the Administrator a complaint, or any other information, relating to compliance by the contractor with subsection (a)(1)(B).

''(c) ACTION FOR VIOLATIONS OF PROHIBITION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.—

''(1) FIRST VIOLATION.—If the head of an executive agency determines that a contractor has violated subsection (a)(1)(B), such head shall—

''(A) notify the contractor;

''(B) provide 30 days after such notification for the contractor to appeal the determination; and

''(C) issue a written warning to the contractor that includes a description of the violation and the additional remedies that may apply for subsequent violations.

''(2) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATION.—If the head of an executive agency determines that a contractor that was subject to paragraph (1) has committed a subsequent violation of subsection (a)(1)(B), such head shall notify the contractor, shall provide 30 days after such notification for the contractor to appeal the determination, and, in consultation with the relevant Federal agencies, may take actions, depending on the severity of the infraction and the contractor's history of violations, including—

''(A) providing written guidance to the contractor that the contractor's eligibility for contracts requires compliance with this section;

''(B) requiring that the contractor respond within 30 days affirming that the contractor is taking steps to comply with this section; and

''(C) suspending payment under the contract for which the applicant was being considered until the contractor demonstrates compliance with this section.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CONDITIONAL OFFER.—The term 'conditional offer' means an offer of employment for a position related to work under a contract that is conditioned upon the results of a criminal history inquiry.

''(2) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD INFORMATION.—The term 'criminal history record information' has the meaning given that term in section 9201 of title 5.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''4714. Prohibition on criminal history inquiries by contractors prior to conditional offer.''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 4714 of title 41, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall apply with respect to contracts awarded pursuant to solicitations issued after the effective date described in section 1092(b)(2) of this subtitle.

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2338 the following new section:

''§ 2339. Prohibition on criminal history inquiries by contractors prior to conditional offer

''(a) LIMITATION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the head of an agency—

''(A) may not require that an individual or sole proprietor who submits a bid for a contract to disclose criminal history record information regarding that individual or sole proprietor before determining the apparent awardee; and

''(B) shall require as a condition of receiving a Federal contract and receiving payments under such contract that the contractor may not verbally or through written form request the disclosure of criminal history record information regarding an applicant for a position related to work under such contract before such contractor extends a conditional offer to the applicant.

''(2) OTHERWISE REQUIRED BY LAW.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to a contract if consideration of criminal history record information prior to a conditional offer with respect to the position is otherwise required by law.

''(3) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to—

''(i) a contract that requires an individual hired under the contract to access classified information or to have sensitive law enforcement or national security duties; or

''(ii) a position that the Secretary of Defense identifies under the regulations issued under subparagraph (B).

''(B) REGULATIONS.—

''(i) ISSUANCE.—Not later than 16 months after the date of enactment of the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with

the Administrator of General Services, shall issue regulations identifying additional positions with respect to which the prohibition under paragraph (1) shall not apply, giving due consideration to positions that involve interaction with minors, access to sensitive information, or managing financial transactions.

''(ii) COMPLIANCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS.—The regulations issued under clause (i) shall—

''(I) be consistent with, and in no way supersede, restrict, or limit the application of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) or other relevant Federal civil rights laws; and

''(II) ensure that all hiring activities conducted pursuant to the regulations are conducted in a manner consistent with relevant Federal civil rights laws.

''(b) COMPLAINT PROCEDURES.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and publish procedures under which an applicant for a position with a Department of Defense contractor may submit a complaint, or any other information, relating to compliance by the contractor with subsection (a)(1)(B).

''(c) ACTION FOR VIOLATIONS OF PROHIBITION ON CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES.—

''(1) FIRST VIOLATION.—If the Secretary of Defense determines that a contractor has violated subsection (a)(1)(B), the Secretary shall—

''(A) notify the contractor;

''(B) provide 30 days after such notification for the contractor to appeal the determination; and

''(C) issue a written warning to the contractor that includes a description of the violation and the additional remedies that may apply for subsequent violations.

''(2) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—If the Secretary of Defense determines that a contractor that was subject to paragraph (1) has committed a subsequent violation of subsection (a)(1)(B), the Secretary shall notify the contractor, shall provide 30 days after such notification for the contractor to appeal the determination, and, in consultation with the relevant Federal agencies, may take actions, depending on the severity of the infraction and the contractor's history of violations, including—

''(A) providing written guidance to the contractor that the contractor's eligibility for contracts requires compliance with this section;

''(B) requiring that the contractor respond within 30 days affirming that the contractor is taking steps to comply with this section; and

''(C) suspending payment under the contract for which the applicant was being considered until the contractor demonstrates compliance with this section.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CONDITIONAL OFFER.—The term 'conditional offer' means an offer of employment for a position related to work under a contract that is conditioned upon the results of a criminal history inquiry.

''(2) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD INFORMATION.—The term 'criminal history record information' has the meaning given that term in section 9201 of title 5.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2339(a) of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall apply with respect to contracts awarded pursuant to solicitations issued after the effective date described in section 1092(b)(2) of this subtitle.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2338 the following new item:

''2339. Prohibition on criminal history inquiries by contractors prior to conditional offer.''.

(c) REVISIONS TO FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall revise the Federal Acquisition Regulation to implement section 4714 of title 41, United States Code, and section 2339 of title 10, United States Code, as added by this section.

(2) CONSISTENCY WITH OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS.—The Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall revise the Federal Acquisition Regulation under paragraph (1) to be consistent with the regulations issued by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under section 1092(b)(1) to the maximum extent practicable. The Council shall include together with such revision an explanation of any substantive modification of the Office of Personnel Management regulations, including an explanation of how such modification will more effectively implement the rights and protections under this section.

SEC. 1094. REPORT ON EMPLOYMENT OF INDIVIDUALS FORMERLY INCARCERATED IN FEDERAL PRISONS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''covered individual''—

(1) means an individual who has completed a term of imprisonment in a Federal prison for a Federal criminal offense; and

(2) does not include an alien who is or will be removed from the United States for a violation of the immigration laws (as such term is defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101)).

(b) STUDY AND REPORT REQUIRED.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in coordination with the Director of the Bureau of the Census, shall—

(1) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, design and initiate a study on the employment of covered individuals after their release from Federal prison, including by collecting—

(A) demographic data on covered individuals, including race, age, and sex; and

(B) data on employment and earnings of covered individuals who are denied employment, including the reasons for the denials; and

(2) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, submit a report that does not include any personally identifiable information on the study conducted under paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

SA 805. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 582. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR THE MY CAREER ADVANCEMENT ACCOUNT PROGRAM TO CERTAIN MILITARY SPOUSES.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR PARTICIPANTS WHOSE SPOUSES RECEIVE PROMOTIONS.—Beginning on October 1, 2020, a military spouse who is participating in the My Career Advancement Account program of the Department of Defense (in this section referred to as the ''Program'') may not become ineligible for the Program solely because the member of the Armed Forces to whom the military spouse is married receives a promotion in grade.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the Program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of employment rates for military spouses that identifies—

(i) the career fields most military spouses frequently pursue; and

(ii) the extent to which such rates may be improved by expanding the Program to include reimbursements for licensing reciprocity.

(B) An assessment of costs required to expand the Program as described in subparagraph (A)(ii).

(c) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, not more than $5,000,000 may be available for the purposes of this section.

SA 806. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. _____. PLAN ON ADVANCEMENT OF FUNDAMENTAL HYPERSONIC SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ACTIVITIES.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to advance fundamental hypersonic science and technology activities.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan submitted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Identification of high priority hypersonics basic research efforts and fundamental research challenges of the Department of Defense.

(2) Identification of organizations designated to fund university hypersonic research.

(3) A plan for partnerships with universities on matters relating to the advancement of fundamental hypersonic science and technology research and development, including by establishing a consortium of research universities.

(4) Development of a strategy for using university expertise to support workforce development, acquisition program oversight, and basic research activities.

(5) Options for university experts to work in Department labs and test centers on hypersonics.

SA 807. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 811. GUIDANCE ON BUY AMERICAN ACT AND BERRY AMENDMENT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) BUY AMERICAN ACT GUIDANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of Defense Pricing/Defense Procurement Acquisition Policy shall review, and if necessary update, and issue guidance to Department of Defense contracting officials on requirements related to chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Buy American Act''). The guidance shall reflect any Department actions taken in response to the April 18, 2017, Executive Order No. 13788, ''Buy American and Hire American'' and in response to the recommendations of the Department of Defense Inspector General report entitled ''Summary Report of DoD Compliance With the Berry Amendment and the Buy American Act''.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The guidance issued under paragraph (1) shall cover—

(A) the requirement to incorporate and enforce the Buy American Act provisions and clauses in applicable solicitations and contracts; and

(B) the requirements of the Buy American Act, such as inclusion of clauses, into the electronic contract writing systems used by the military departments and the Defense Logistics Agency.

(b) BERRY AMENDMENT GUIDANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of Defense Pricing/Defense Procurement Acquisition Policy shall review, and if necessary update, and issue guidance to Department of Defense contracting officials on requirements related to section 2533a of title 10, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Berry Amendment'').

(2) ELEMENTS.—The guidance issued under paragraph (1) shall cover—

(A) the requirement to incorporate and enforce the Berry Amendment in applicable solicitations and contracts; and

(B) the requirements of the Berry Amendment, such as inclusion of clauses, into the electronic contract writing systems used by the military departments and the Defense Logistics Agency.

(c) BRIEFING ON ACTIVITIES.—Not later than March 1, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall brief the congressional defense committees on activities undertaken pursuant to this section.

SA 808. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 811. REPORT ON CONTRACTOR DENIAL OF COST OR PRICING DATA REQUESTS.

Not later than December 31, 2020, and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment shall submit to Congress a report summarizing each case in which a contractor refused a request from the contracting officer for uncertified cost or pricing data.

SA 809. Mr. ROMNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1262. POLICY WITH RESPECT TO EXPANSION OF COOPERATION WITH ALLIES AND PARTNERS IN THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION AND EUROPE REGARDING THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress supports the finding on the People's Republic of China articulated in the 2018 National Defense Strategy and the 2017 National Security Strategy.

(2) The People's Republic of China is leveraging military modernization, influence operations, and predatory economics to coerce neighboring countries to reorder the Indo-Pacific region to the advantage of the People's Republic of China.

(3) As the People's Republic of China continues its economic and military ascendance, asserting power through a whole of government long-term strategy, the People's Republic of China will continue to pursue a military modernization program that seeks Indo-Pacific regional hegemony in the near-term and displacement of the United States to achieve global preeminence in the future.

(4) The most far-reaching objective of the defense strategy of the United States is to set the military relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China on a path toward transparency and nonaggression.

(5) The People's Republic of China uses economic inducements and penalties, influence operations, and implied military threats to persuade other countries to heed the political and security agenda of the People's Republic of China.

(6) United States allies and partners are critical to effective competition with the People's Republic of China.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to expand military, diplomatic, and economic alliances and partnerships in the Indo-Pacific region and with Europe and like-minded countries around the globe that are critical to effective competition with the People's Republic of China; and

(2) to develop, in collaboration with such allies and partners, a unified approach to addressing and deterring significant diplomatic, economic, and military challenges posed by the People's Republic of China.

SA 810. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1290. EXCLUSION OF IMPOSITION OF DUTIES AND IMPORT QUOTAS FROM PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITIES UNDER INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY ECONOMIC POWERS ACT.

Section 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702) is amended—

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

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

''(c)(1) The authority granted to the President by this section does not include the authority to impose duties or tariff-rate quotas or (subject to paragraph (2)) other quotas on articles entering the United States.

''(2) The limitation under paragraph (1) does not prohibit the President from excluding all articles, or all of a certain type of article, imported from a country from entering the United States.''.

SA 811. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1290. UNITED STATES PROPORTIONAL FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

The financial contributions of the United States to the United Nations shall be proportional to the number of member countries of the United Nations.

SA 812. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1290. UNITED STATES PROPORTIONAL FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO NATO.

The financial contributions of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization shall be proportional to the number of member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

SA 813. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 342. REPORT ON UTILIZATION OF 24TH TACTICAL AIR SUPPORT SQUADRON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 1, 2019, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the utilization of the 24th Tactical Air Support Squadron and the sortie allocation to training in close air support.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Due to limited fighter and bomber aircraft availability, it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Air Force should utilize additional contract close air support in fiscal year 2020 to meet the growing training requirements for Joint Terminal Attack Controllers in the Air Force, including the reserve components.

SA 814. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Section 5211 is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 5211. DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION STRATEGY TO PROCURE SECURE, LOW PROBABILITY OF DETECTION DATA LINK NETWORK CAPABILITY.

The text of subsections (a) through (c) of section 211 are hereby deemed to read as follows:

''(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—Not later than April 1, 2020, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff of the Army shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a joint development and acquisition strategy to procure a secure, low probability of detection data link network capability, with the ability to effectively operate in hostile jamming environments while preserving the low observability characteristics of the relevant platforms, including both existing and planned platforms.

''(b) NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS.—The data link network capability to be procured pursuant to the development and acquisition strategy submitted under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) ensure that any network made with such capability will be low risk and affordable, with minimal impact or change to existing host platforms and minimal overall integration costs;

''(2) use a non-proprietary and open systems approach compatible with the Rapid Capabilities Office Open Mission Systems initiative of the Air Force and the Future Airborne Capability Environment initiative of the Navy; and

''(3) provide for an architecture to connect, with operationally relevant throughput and latency—

''(A) fifth-generation combat aircraft;

''(B) fifth-generation and fourth-generation combat aircraft;

''(C) fifth-generation and fourth-generation combat aircraft and appropriate support aircraft and other network nodes for command, control, communications, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance purposes; and

''(D) fifth-generation and fourth-generation combat aircraft and their associated network-enabled precision weapons.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2020 for operations and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, for operations and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Navy, and for operations and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Army, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the date that is 15 days after the date on which the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff of the Army submit the development and acquisition strategy required by subsection (a).''.

SA 815. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FEES ERRONEOUSLY COLLECTED BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR HOUSING LOANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of Veterans Affairs offers a Department backed home loan for which veterans are generally required to pay fees to defray the cost of administering the home loan.

(2) Veterans are exempt from paying the fees if they are entitled to receive disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(3) Between January 1, 2012, and December 31, 2017, veterans paid fees of more than $286,000,000 in association with Department backed home loans despite being exempt from such fees. Fees paid included $65,800,000 in fees that could have been avoided.

(4) Of those erroneously paid fees, $189,000,000 in fee refunds are still due to veterans.

(5) More than 70,000 veterans may have been affected by these erroneously paid fees.

(b) REFUNDS OF ERRONEOUSLY COLLECTED FEES.—Section 3729(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3)(A) The Secretary shall develop a process for determining whether a fee has been collected under this section from a veteran described in paragraph (1).

''(B) If the Secretary determines that a fee was collected under this section from an veteran described in paragraph (1), the Secretary pay to such veteran an amount equal to the amount of the fee collected.

''(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a payment under this paragraph shall not be subject to Federal, State, or other tax liability or reporting requirement.

''(D) A payment under subparagraph (B) shall be made directly to a veteran, notwithstanding any current loan balance of the veteran or the manner in which the fee was originally collected.

''(4)(A) The Secretary shall develop an automated process for refunding fees under paragraph (3)(B).

''(B) For any individual identified under the process developed under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall process the refund without requiring further request.''.

(c) PLAN TO IDENTIFY INDIVIDUALS WHO WERE ERRONEOUSLY CHARGED FEES.—

(1) ERRONEOUS CHARGES JANUARY 1, 2012, TO DECEMBER 31, 2017.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a plan to identify veterans described in subsection (c)(1) of section 3729 of title 38, United States Code, from whom a fee was collected under such section during the period beginning on January 1, 2012, and ending on December 31, 2017.

(B) CONTENTS.—The plan submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(i) The number of veterans who may be due a refund of the fee.

(ii) A timeline for the refunding of fees.

(2) ERRONEOUS CHARGES BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2012.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a plan to identify veterans described in subsection (c)(1) of section 3729 of title 38, United States Code, from whom a fee was collected under such section before January 1, 2012.

(B) CONTENTS.—The plan submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(i) The number of veterans who may be due a refund of the fee.

(ii) A timeline for the refunding of fees.

(d) PLAN TO PROCESS REFUNDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a plan to process refunds of fees that were collected under section 3729 of title 38, United States Code, from individuals described in subsection (c)(1) of such section.

(e) ANNUAL REPORT ON REFUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than once each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report on refunds of fees collected under section 3729 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include, for the period covered by the report:

(A) The number of fees collected under such section that were refunded and applied to a home loan balance.

(B) The number of such refunds for which the Secretary received documentation of the application of a refund to a home loan balance.

(f) ACCURACY OF CERTIFICATES OF ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall update such policies as may be necessary to ensure that certificates of eligibility are accurate at the time they are used for the purposes of determining eligibility for housing loans guaranteed, insured, or made under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, and for pursues of determining eligibility for exemption from the collection of fees under section 3729 of such title.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the solution developed under paragraph (1).

(g) AUDIT PLAN.—

(1) PLAN REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall develop a plan to audit the Department on an annual basis to determine the rate at which fees are erroneously collected under section 3729 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 60 days after the completion of any audit conducted pursuant to the plan developed under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the audit.

SA 816. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFINITION OF EMPLOYER UNDER NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT.

Section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 152) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''or any Indian Tribe, or any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian Tribe and located on its Indian lands,'' after ''subdivision thereof,''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(15) The term 'Indian Tribe' means any Indian Tribe, band, nation, pueblo, or other organized group or community which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

''(16) The term 'Indian' means any individual who is a member of an Indian Tribe.

''(17) The term 'Indian lands' means—

''(A) all lands within the limits of any Indian reservation;

''(B) any lands title to which is either held in trust by the United States for the benefit of any Indian Tribe or Indian or held by any Indian Tribe or Indian subject to restriction by the United States against alienation; and

''(C) any lands in the State of Oklahoma that are within the boundaries of a former reservation (as defined by the Secretary of the Interior) of a federally recognized Indian Tribe.''.

SA 817. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1025.

SA 818. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1025 and insert the following:

SEC. 1025. SENSE OF SENATE ON TRANSFER OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO THE UNITED STATES TEMPORARILY FOR EMERGENCY OR CRITICAL MEDICAL TREATMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense could temporarily transfer an individual detained at Guantanamo to a Department of Defense medical facility in the United States for the sole purpose of providing the individual medical treatment if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the medical treatment of the individual is necessary to prevent death or imminent significant injury or harm to the health of the individual;

(2) the necessary medical treatment is not available to be provided at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, without incurring excessive and unreasonable costs; and

(3) the Department of Defense has provided for appropriate security measures for the custody and control of the individual during any period in which the individual is temporarily in the United States pursuant to such transfer.

(b) INDIVIDUAL DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''individual detained at Guantanamo'' means an individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(1) is not a national of the United States (as defined in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22)) or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay.

SA 819. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. _____. REDESIGNATION OF THE COMMANDANT OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY AS THE DIRECTOR AND CHANCELLOR OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9414b of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Commandant'' each place it appears and inserting ''Director and Chancellor''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any references in any law, regulations, map, document, paper or other record of the United States to the Commandant of the United States Air Force Institute of Technology shall be deemed to be reference to the Director and Chancellor of the United States Air Force Institute of Technology.

SA 820. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PILOT PROGRAM TO IMPROVE PUBLIC-PRIVATE CYBERSECURITY OPERATIONAL COLLABORATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''appropriate congressional committees and leadership'' means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Armed Services, the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Armed Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Speaker, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives;

(2) the term ''appropriate Federal agencies'' means—

(A) the Department of Homeland Security; and

(B) any other agency, as determined by the Secretary;

(3) the term ''collaboration effort'' means an effort undertaken by the appropriate Federal agencies and 1 or more non-Federal entities under the pilot program in order to carry out the purpose of the pilot program;

(4) the term ''critical infrastructure'' has the meaning given that term in section 1016(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e));

(5) the term ''cybersecurity provider'' means a non-Federal entity that provides cybersecurity services to another non-Federal entity;

(6) the term ''cybersecurity threat'' means a cybersecurity threat, as defined in section 102 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 1501), that affects—

(A) the national security of the United States; or

(B) critical infrastructure in the United States;

(7) the term ''malicious cyber actor'' means an entity that poses a cybersecurity threat;

(8) the term ''non-Federal entity'' has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 1501); and

(9) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT; PURPOSE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, may establish a pilot program under which the appropriate Federal agencies, as coordinated and facilitated by the Secretary, may identify and partner with cybersecurity organizations capable of enabling information sharing of cybersecurity threats among cybersecurity providers in order to coordinate and magnify Federal and non-Federal efforts to prevent or disrupt cybersecurity threats or malicious cyber actors, by, as appropriate—

(1) sharing information relating to potential actions by the Federal Government against cybersecurity threats or malicious cyber actors with non-Federal entities; and

(2) facilitating coordination between the appropriate Federal agencies and non-Federal entities relating to cybersecurity threats or malicious cyber actors.

(c) PARTICIPATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The heads of other Federal departments and agencies may choose to participate in the pilot program on a voluntary basis.

(2) IMPACT ON OTHER INFORMATION SHARING ARRANGEMENTS.—Implementation of the pilot program shall not adversely impact the operations of the Federal cyber security centers or any other information sharing arrangements between a Federal department or agency and a private sector entity entered into before or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) FEDERAL COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall facilitate all Federal coordination, planning, and action relating to the pilot program.

(e) ANNUAL REPORTS TO APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report on the collaboration efforts carried out during the year for which the report is submitted, which shall include—

(A) a statement of the total number collaboration efforts carried out during the year;

(B) with respect to each collaboration effort carried out during the year—

(i) a statement of—

(I) the identity of any malicious cyber actor that, as a result of a cybersecurity threat that the malicious cyber actor engaged in or was likely to engage in, was a subject of the collaboration effort;

(II) the responsibilities under the collaboration effort of each appropriate Federal agency and each non-Federal entity that participated in the collaboration effort; and

(III) whether the goal of the collaboration effort was achieved; and

(ii) a description of how each appropriate Federal agency and each non-Federal entity that participated in the collaboration effort collaborated in carrying out the collaboration effort; and

(C) a description of—

(i) the ways in which the collaboration efforts carried out during the year—

(I) were successful; and

(II) could have been improved; and

(ii) how the Secretary will improve collaboration efforts carried out on or after the date on which the report is submitted.

(2) FORM.—Any report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(f) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(1) authorize a non-Federal entity to engage in any activity in violation of section 1030(a) of title 18, United States Code; or

(2) limit an appropriate Federal agency or a non-Federal entity from engaging in a lawful activity.

SA 821. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR ACQUISITION OF A TRANSMISSION ELECTRON MICROSCOPE.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2020 by section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation is hereby increased by $5,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for Defense Research Sciences (PE 0601102A).

(2) AVAILABILITY.—The amount available under paragraph (1) shall be available for transmission electron microscopy equipment and research to support the following:

(A) Advanced analyses of materials for biomedical research.

(B) Micro- and nano-electronics research.

(C) Advanced manufacturing and materials research and development.

(D) Superconductivity research.

(E) For such other matters as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2020 by section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation is hereby decreased by $5,000,000, with the amount of the decrease to be taken from amounts made available for Future Advanced Weapon Analysis & Programs (PE 0604200F).

SA 822. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7131 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e)(1)(A) Not later than March 31 of each calendar year, the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget, shall submit to each House of Congress a report on the operation of this section during the fiscal year last ending before the start of such calendar year.

''(B) Not later than December 31 of each calendar year, each agency (as defined by section 7103(a)(3)) shall furnish to the Office of Personnel Management the information which such Office requires, with respect to such agency, for purposes of the report which is next due under subparagraph (A).

''(2) Each report by the Office of Personnel Management under this subsection shall include, with respect to the fiscal year described in paragraph (1)(A), at least the following information:

''(A) The total amount of official time granted to employees.

''(B) The average amount of official time expended per bargaining unit employee.

''(C) The specific types of activities or purposes for which official time was granted, and the impact which the granting of such official time for such activities or purposes had on agency operations.

''(D) The total number of employees to whom official time was granted, and, of that total, the number who were not engaged in any activities or purposes except activities or purposes involving the use of official time.

''(E) The total amount of compensation (including fringe benefits) afforded to employees in connection with activities or purposes for which they were granted official time.

''(F) The total amount of official time spent by employees representing Federal employees who are not union members in matters authorized by this chapter.

''(G) A description of any room or space designated at the agency (or its subcomponent) where official time activities will be conducted, including the square footage of any such room or space.

''(3) All information included in a report by the Office of Personnel Management under this subsection with respect to a fiscal year—

''(A) shall be shown both agency-by-agency and for all agencies; and

''(B) shall be accompanied by the corresponding information (submitted by the Office in its report under this subsection) for the fiscal year before the fiscal year to which such report pertains, together with appropriate comparisons and analyses.

''(4) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'official time' means any period of time, regardless of agency nomenclature—

''(A) which may be granted to an employee under this chapter (including a collective bargaining agreement entered into under this chapter) to perform representational or consultative functions; and

''(B) during which the employee would otherwise be in a duty status.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective beginning with the report which, under the provisions of such amendment, is first required to be submitted by the Office of Personnel Management to each House of Congress by a date which occurs at least 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 823. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1086. AMENDMENTS TO THE SOAR ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''SOAR Reauthorization Act of 2019''.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO SOAR.—The Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (division C of Public Law 112–10) is amended—

(1) in section 3007 (sec. 38–1853.07 D.C. Official Code)—

(A) by striking subsection (c) and redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c);

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking ''AND PARENTAL ASSISTANCE'' and inserting '', PARENTAL ASSISTANCE, AND STUDENT ACADEMIC ASSISTANCE'';

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''$2,000,000'' and inserting ''$2,200,000''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) The expenses of providing tutoring service to participating eligible students that need additional academic assistance. If there are insufficient funds to provide tutoring services to all such students in a year, the eligible entity shall give priority in such

year to students who previously attended an elementary school or secondary school identified as one of the lowest-performing schools under the District of Columbia's accountability system.''; and

(C) in subsection (c), as redesignated by subparagraph (A)—

(i) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''subsections (b) and (c)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''subsections (b) and (c)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)'';

(2) in section 3008(h) (sec. 38–1853.08 D.C. Official Code)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''section 3009(a)(2)(A)(i)'' and inserting ''section 3009(a)'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) The Institute of Education Sciences may administer assessments to students participating in the evaluation under section 3009(a) for the purpose of conducting the evaluation under such section.''; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''the nationally norm-referenced standardized test described in paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''a nationally norm-referenced standardized test'';

(3) in section 3009(a) (sec. 38–1853.09 D.C. Official Code)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''annually'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) is rigorous; and''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''impact of the program'' and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting ''impact of the program on academic achievement and educational attainment.'';

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''ON EDUCATION'' and inserting ''OF EDUCATION'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting ''the academic progress of'' after ''assess''; and

(II) by striking ''in each of grades 3'' and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting ''; and'';

(iii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(iv) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''A comparison of the academic achievement of participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship on the measurements described in paragraph (3)(B) to the academic achievement'' and inserting ''The academic progress of participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship compared to the academic progress'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''increasing the satisfaction of such parents and students with their choice'' and inserting ''those parents' and students' satisfaction with the program''; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (D) through (F) and inserting the following:

''(D) The high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates, college persistence rates, and college graduation rates of participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship compared with the rates of public school students described in subparagraph (A), to the extent practicable.

''(E) The college enrollment rates, college persistence rates, and college graduation rates of students who participated in the program as the result of winning the Opportunity Scholarship Program lottery compared to the enrollment, persistence, and graduation rates for students who entered but did not win such lottery and who, as a result, served as the control group for previous evaluations of the program under this division. Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to waive section 3004(a)(3)(A)(iii) with respect to any such student.

''(F) The safety of the schools attended by participating eligible students who use an opportunity scholarship compared with the schools in the District of Columbia attended by public school students described in subparagraph (A), to the extent practicable.''; and

(4) in section 3014(a) (sec. 38–1853.14, D.C. Official Code), by striking ''fiscal year 2019'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2024''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall take effect on September 30, 2019.

SA 824. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. LEVERAGING COMMERCIAL SATELLITE REMOTE SENSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In acquiring geospatial-intelligence, the Secretary of Defense shall leverage, to the maximum extent practicable, the capabilities of United States industry, including through the use of commercial geospatial-intelligence services and acquisition of commercial satellite imagery.

(b) OBTAINING FUTURE DATA.—The Secretary, as part of an analysis of alternatives for the future acquisition of Department of Defense space systems for geospatial-intelligence, shall—

(1) consider whether there is a suitable, cost-effective, commercial capability available that can meet any or all of the Department's requirements;

(2) if a suitable, cost-effective, commercial capability is available as described in paragraph (1), determine whether it is in the national interest to develop a governmental space system; and

(3) include, as part of the established acquisition reporting requirements to the appropriate committees of Congress, any determination made under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(c) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees;

(2) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(3) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 825. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 342. REPORT ON EFFECT OF WIND TURBINE PROJECTS ON SAFETY, TRAINING, AND READINESS OF AIR FORCE PILOTS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the cumulative effect of wind turbine projects on the safety, training, and readiness of Air Force pilots.

SA 826. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1086. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION AND THE GOVERNMENT OF BELGIUM BY WHICH THE COMMISSION WOULD ACQUIRE, RESTORE, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN THE MARDASSON MEMORIAL IN BASTOGNE, BELGIUM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress make the following findings:

(1) The Battle of the Bulge was the largest land battle of World War II in which the United States fought, yielded more than 75,000 American casualties over the winter of 1944–1945, and stopped the final German offensive on the Western Front.

(2) The Battle of the Bulge is the second largest battle fought in the history of the United States Army.

(3) Following the war, Belgian groups raised funds to construct the Mardasson Memorial in Bastogne, Belgium, to honor Americans killed, wounded, and missing in action during the Battle of the Bulge.

(4) The Mardasson Memorial, inaugurated in 1950, is a five-pointed American star with the history of the battle, the names of the units that fought, and the names of the States engraved in gold letters throughout.

(5) The Mardasson Memorial, owned and maintained by the Government of Belgium, and the only memorial to the United States effort during the Battle of the Bulge, is in need of extensive repair to restore it to a condition commensurate to the service and sacrifice it honors.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress to support an agreement between the American Battle Monument Commission (hereinafter referred to as ''ABMC'') and the Government of Belgium—

(1) under the monument maintenance program of the ABMC, and subject to the requirements of such program, by which the ABMC would use its expertise and presence in Europe to oversee restoration of the Mardasson Memorial in preparation for the 75th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge; and

(2) under the monument trust fund program of the ABMC, and subject to the requirements of such program, by which the ABMC assumes ownership and responsibility for the Mardasson Memorial, ensuring that the Memorial stands for decades to come, honoring American service and sacrifice, and inspiring future generations.

SA 827. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1272. REPORT ON IMPROVEMENTS TO DETERRENCE EFFORTS WITH RESPECT TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with Commander of the United States Indo-Pacific Command and the Commander of the United States European Command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing efforts of the Department of Defense to improve the ability of the United States Armed Forces to conduct combined joint operations—

(1) to deny the ability of the People's Republic of China to execute a fait accompli against Taiwan; and

(2) to deny the ability of the Russian Federation to execute a fait accompli against one or more Baltic allies.

(b) MATTER TO BE INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall identify prioritized requirements for further improving the ability of the United States Armed Forces to conduct combined joint operations to achieve the objectives described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of that subsection.

(c) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall—

(1) be submitted in classified form; and

(2) include an unclassified summary appropriate for release to the public.

(d) FAIT ACCOMPLI DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''fait accompli'' means a scenario in which the People's Republic of China or the Russian Federation uses force to rapidly seize territory and subsequently threatens further escalation, potentially including the use of nuclear weapons, to deter an effective response by the United States Armed Forces through combined joint operations.

SA 828. Ms. MCSALLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ILLEGAL BORDER CROSSINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) During the first 5 months of May 2019, the United States Border Patrol has apprehended more than 593,000 people ilegally crossing the southern border of the United States, which represents more apprehension than in all of 2018.

(2) In May 2019, 132,887 people were apprehended by the United States Border Patrol, of whom more than 96,000 were part of family units or unaccompanied minors.

(3) This recent surge in illegal border crossings—

(A) has placed an unprecedented strain on the resources of the Department of Homeland Security, which has responded by directing U.S. Customs and Border Patrol resources away from legal ports of entry; and

(B) exceeds the capacity of the Department of Health and Human Services, which is responsible for the care of unaccompanied children who are apprehended at the border.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the recent surge of illegal border crossings—

(A) is a national security threat; and

(B) has put significant strain on the departments and agencies that are responsible for securing the border, implementing our Nation's immigration laws, and providing temporary housing for the people who are awaiting removal proceedings; and

(2) the recent increase in apprehensions along the southern border, coupled with the lack of sufficient resources at the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Health and Human Services will further exacerbate this humanitarian crisis.

SA 829. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part I of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5____. PILOT PROGRAM ON EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS FOR MILITARY DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available under subsection (k), the Secretary shall carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary shall establish education savings accounts for eligible military students to enable such students to attend public or private elementary schools or secondary schools selected by the students' parents.

(b) DURATION.—The pilot program under this section shall begin with the first school year that begins after the date of enactment of this section and shall terminate at the end of the fifth school year that begins after such date of enactment.

(c) SCOPE OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall select one military installation to participate in the pilot program under this section. In making such selection, the Secretary shall choose a military installation at which eligible military students will derive the greatest benefit from expanded educational options, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) DEPOSITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall deposit funds in the amount specified in paragraph (2) into each education savings account established on behalf of an eligible military student under this section.

(2) AMOUNT OF DEPOSIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount deposited into each education savings account awarded to an eligible military student shall be $6,000 for each school year.

(B) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—For each school year after the first full school year of the program, the amount specified in subparagraph (A) shall be adjusted to reflect changes for the 12-month period ending the preceding June in the Chained Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

(e) ELIGIBLE USES OF FUNDS.—Funds deposited into an education savings account under this section for a school year may be used by the parent of an eligible military student to make payments to a qualified educational service provider that is approved by the Secretary under subsection (f) for—

(1) costs of attendance at a private elementary school or secondary school recognized by the State, which may include a private school that has a religious mission;

(2) private online programs;

(3) private tutoring;

(4) services provided by a public elementary school or secondary school attended by the child on a less than full-time basis, including individual classes and extracurricular activities and programs;

(5) textbooks, curriculum programs, or other instructional materials, including any supplemental materials required by a curriculum program, private school, private online learning program, or a public school, or any parent directed curriculum associated with kindergarten through grade 12 education;

(6) educational services and therapies, including occupational, behavioral, physical, speech-language, and audiology therapies; or

(7) any other educational expenses approved by the Secretary.

(f) REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFIED EDUCATIONAL SERVICE PROVIDERS.—The Secretary shall establish and maintain a registry of qualified educational service providers that are approved to receive payments from an education savings account established under this section. The Secretary shall approve a qualified educational service provider to receive such payments if the provider demonstrates to the Secretary that it is licensed in the State in which it operates to provide one or more of the services for which funds may be expended under subsection (e).

(g) PARTICIPATION IN ONLINE MARKET PLACE.—As a condition of receiving funds from an education savings account, a qualified educational service provider shall make its services available for purchase through the online marketplace described in subsection (h).

(h) ONLINE MARKETPLACE.—The Secretary shall seek to enter into a contract with a private-sector entity under which the entity shall—

(1) establish and operate an online marketplace that enables the holder of an education savings account to make direct purchases from qualified educational service providers using funds from such account;

(2) ensure that each qualified educational service provider on the registry maintained by the Secretary under subsection (f) has made its services available for purchase through the online marketplace;

(3) ensure that all purchases made through the online marketplace are for services that are allowable uses of funds under this section; and

(4) develop and make available a standardized expense report form, in electronic and hard copy formats, to be used by parents for reporting expenses.

(i) IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—No Federal requirements shall apply to a qualified educational service provider other than the requirements specifically set forth in this section. Nothing in this section shall be construed to require a qualified educational service provider to alter its creed, practices, admissions policy, or curriculum in order to be eligible to receive payments from an education savings account.

(j) REPORTS.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than July 30 of the first year of the pilot program, and

each subsequent year through the year in which the final report is submitted under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress an interim report on the accounts awarded under the pilot program under this section that includes the content described in paragraph (3) for the applicable school year of the report.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the end of the pilot program under this section, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report on the accounts awarded under the pilot program that includes the content described in paragraph (3) for each school year of the program.

(3) CONTENT.—Each report under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall identify—

(A) the number of applicants for education savings accounts under this section;

(B) the number of elementary school students receiving education savings accounts under this section and the number of secondary school students receiving such savings accounts;

(C) the results of a survey, conducted by the Secretary, regarding parental satisfaction with the education savings account program under this section; and

(D) any other information the Secretary determines to be necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

(l) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ESEA DEFINITIONS.—The terms ''child'', ''elementary school'', and ''secondary school'' have the meanings given the terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) ELIGIBLE MILITARY STUDENT.—The term ''eligible military student'' means a child who—

(A) is a military dependent student;

(B) lives on the military installation selected to participate in the program under this section; and

(C) chooses to attend a participating school or purchase other approved education services, rather than attending the school otherwise assigned to the child.

(3) MILITARY DEPENDENT STUDENTS.—The term ''military dependent students'' has the meaning given the term in section 572(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 20 U.S.C. 7703b(e)).

(4) QUALIFIED EDUCATIONAL SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ''qualified educational service provider'' means an entity or person that is licensed by a State to provide one or more of the educational services for which funds may be expended under subsection (e), including—

(A) a private school;

(B) a nonpublic online learning program or course provider;

(C) a State institution of higher education, which may include a community college or a technical college;

(D) a public school;

(E) a private tutor or entity that operates a tutoring facility;

(F) a provider of educational materials or curriculum;

(G) a provider of education-related therapies or services; or

(H) any other provider of educational services licensed by a State to provide such services.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Defense.

SA 830. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 729. STUDY ON USE OF ROUTINE NEUROIMAGING MODALITIES IN DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, AND PREVENTION OF BRAIN INJURY DUE TO BLAST PRESSURE EXPOSURE DURING COMBAT AND TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the feasibility and effectiveness of the use of routine neuroimaging modalities in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of brain injury among members of the Armed Forces due to one or more blast pressure exposures during combat and training.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives an interim report on the methods and action plan for the study under subsection (a).

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date on which the Secretary begins the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the results of such study.

SA 831. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XXX, add the following:

SEC. 3022. INVESTIGATION OF REPORTS OF REPRISALS RELATING TO PRIVATIZED MILITARY HOUSING AND TREATMENT AS MATERIAL BREACH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2890 the following new section:

''§ 2890a. Investigation of reports of reprisals and treatment as material breach

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Housing Officer designated under section 2872b of this title, in coordination with the Secretary of the military department concerned, shall investigate all reports of reprisal against a member of the armed forces for reporting an issue relating to a housing unit under this subchapter.

''(b) MATERIAL BREACH.—If the Chief Housing Officer, in coordination with the Secretary of the military department concerned, determines under subsection (a) that a landlord has retaliated against a member of the armed forces for reporting an issue relating to a housing unit under this subchapter, the landlord shall be deemed to have committed a material breach of the contract of the landlord for purposes of section 2874b(1) of this title.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2890 the following new item:

''2890a. Investigation of reports of reprisals and treatment as material breach.''.

SA 832. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. JUSTICE FOR SERVICEMEMBERS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Justice for Servicemembers Act''.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to prohibit predispute arbitration agreements that force arbitration of disputes arising from claims brought under chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, and the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.); and

(2) to prohibit agreements and practices that interfere with the right of persons to participate in a joint, class, or collective action related to disputes arising from claims brought under the provisions of the laws described in paragraph (1).

(c) ARBITRATION OF DISPUTES INVOLVING THE RIGHTS OF SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title 9, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''CHAPTER 4—ARBITRATION OF SERVICEMEMBER AND VETERAN DISPUTES

''Sec.
''401. Definitions.
''402. No validity or enforceability.

''§ 401. Definitions

''In this chapter—

''(1) the term 'predispute arbitration agreement' means an agreement to arbitrate a dispute that has not yet arisen at the time of the making of the agreement; and

''(2) the term 'predispute joint-action waiver' means an agreement, whether or not part of a predispute arbitration agreement, that would prohibit, or waive the right of, one of the parties to the agreement to participate in a joint, class, or collective action in a judicial, arbitral, administrative, or other forum, concerning a dispute that has not yet arisen at the time of the making of the agreement.

''§ 402. No validity or enforceability

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no predispute arbitration agreement or predispute joint-action waiver shall be valid or enforceable with respect to a dispute relating to disputes arising under chapter 43 of title 38 or the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.).

''(b) APPLICABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An issue as to whether this chapter applies with respect to a dispute shall be determined under Federal law. The applicability of this chapter to an agreement to arbitrate and the validity and enforceability of an agreement to which this chapter applies shall be determined by a court,

rather than an arbitrator, irrespective of whether the party resisting arbitration challenges the arbitration agreement specifically or in conjunction with other terms of the contract containing such agreement, and irrespective of whether the agreement purports to delegate such determinations to an arbitrator.

''(2) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this chapter shall apply to any arbitration provision in a contract between an employer and a labor organization or between labor organizations, except that no such arbitration provision shall have the effect of waiving the right of a worker to seek judicial enforcement of a right arising under a provision of the Constitution of the United States, a State constitution, or a Federal or State statute, or public policy arising therefrom.''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Title 9 of the United States Code is amended—

(i) in section 1 by striking ''of seamen,'' and all that follows through ''interstate commerce'' and inserting ''persons and causes of action under chapter 43 of title 38 or the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.)'';

(ii) in section 2 by inserting ''or as otherwise provided in chapter 4'' before the period at the end;

(iii) in section 208—

(I) in the section heading, by striking ''**Chapter 1; residual application**'' and inserting ''**Application**''; and

(II) by adding at the end the following: ''This chapter applies to the extent that this chapter is not in conflict with chapter 4.''; and

(iv) in section 307—

(I) in the section heading, by striking ''**Chapter 1; residual application**'' and inserting ''**Application**''; and

(II) by adding at the end the following: ''This chapter applies to the extent that this chapter is not in conflict with chapter 4.''.

(B) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—

(i) CHAPTER 2.—The table of sections for chapter 2 of title 9, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 208 and inserting the following:

''208. Application.''.

(ii) CHAPTER 3.—The table of sections for chapter 3 of title 9, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 307 and inserting the following:

''307. Application.''.

(C) TABLE OF CHAPTERS.—The table of chapters of title 9, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''4. Arbitration of servicemember and veteran disputes ..... 401''.

(d) LIMITATION ON WAIVER OF RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS UNDER SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Section 107(a) of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3918(a)) is amended—

(A) in the second sentence, by inserting ''and if it is made after a specific dispute has arisen and the dispute is identified in the waiver'' before the period at the end; and

(B) in the third sentence by inserting ''and if it is made after a specific dispute has arisen and the dispute is identified in the waiver'' before the period at the end.

(2) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to waivers made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) APPLICABILITY.—This section, and the amendments made by this section, shall apply with respect to any dispute or claim that arises or accrues on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 833. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title V, add the following:

SEC. 594. PILOT PROGRAM ON DIGITAL ENGINEERING FOR THE JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program in accordance with this section to assess the feasibility and advisability of activities to enhance the preparation of students in the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps for careers in digital engineering.

(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary of Defense may coordinate with the following:

(1) The Secretary of Education.

(2) The National Science Foundation.

(3) The heads of such other Federal, State, and local government entities as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(4) Such private sector organizations as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(c) ACTIVITIES.—Activities under the pilot program may include the following:

(1) Establishment of targeted internships and cooperative research opportunities in digital engineering at defense laboratories, test ranges, and other organizations for students in and instructors of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(2) Support for training and other support for instructors to improve digital engineering education activities relevant to Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs and students.

(3) Efforts and activities that improve the quality of digital engineering education, training opportunities, and curricula for students and instructors.

(4) Development of professional development opportunities, demonstrations, mentoring programs, and informal education for students and instructors.

(d) METRICS.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish outcome-based metrics and internal and external assessments to evaluate the merits and benefits of activities conducted under the pilot program with respect to the needs of the Department of Defense.

(e) AUTHORITIES.—In carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary of Defense may use the authorities under chapter 111 and sections 2363, 2605, and 2374a of title 10, United States Code, and such other authorities the Secretary considers appropriate.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on any activities carried out under the pilot program.

SA 834. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION PERSONNEL.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Securing America's Ports of Entry Act of 2019''.

(b) ADDITIONAL U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION PERSONNEL.—

(1) OFFICERS.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall hire, train, and assign not fewer than 600 new Office of Field Operations officers above the current attrition level during every fiscal year until the total number of Office of Field Operations officers equals and sustains the requirements identified each year in the Workload Staffing Model.

(2) SUPPORT STAFF.—The Commissioner is authorized to hire, train, and assign support staff, including technicians, to perform non-law enforcement administrative functions to support the new Office of Field Operations officers hired pursuant to paragraph (1).

(3) TRAFFIC FORECASTS.—In calculating the number of Office of Field Operations officers needed at each port of entry through the Workload Staffing Model, the Office of Field Operations shall—

(A) rely on data collected regarding the inspections and other activities conducted at each such port of entry; and

(B) consider volume from seasonal surges, other projected changes in commercial and passenger volumes, the most current commercial forecasts, and other relevant information.

(4) GAO REPORT.—If the Commissioner does not hire the 600 additional Office of Field Operations officers authorized under paragraph (1) during fiscal year 2020, or during any subsequent fiscal year in which the hiring requirements set forth in the Workload Staffing Model have not been achieved, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(A) conduct a review of U.S. Customs and Border Protection hiring practices to determine the reasons that such requirements were not achieved and other issues related to hiring by U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and

(B) submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that describes the results of the review conducted under subparagraph (A).

(c) PORTS OF ENTRY INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCEMENT REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that identifies—

(1) infrastructure improvements at ports of entry that would enhance the ability of Office of Field Operations officers to interdict opioids and other drugs that are being illegally transported into the United States, including a description of circumstances at specific ports of entry that prevent the deployment of technology used at other ports of entry;

(2) detection equipment that would improve the ability of such officers to identify opioids, including precursors and derivatives, that are being illegally transported into the United States; and

(3) safety equipment that would protect such officers from accidental exposure to such drugs or other dangers associated with the inspection of potential drug traffickers.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) TEMPORARY DUTY ASSIGNMENTS.—

(A) QUARTERLY REPORT.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, in consultation with the Executive Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations, shall submit a quarterly report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes, for the reporting period—

(i) the number of temporary duty assignments;

(ii) the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection employees required for each temporary duty assignment;

(iii) the ports of entry from which such employees were reassigned;

(iv) the ports of entry to which such employees were reassigned;

(v) the ports of entry at which reimbursable service agreements have been entered into that may be affected by temporary duty assignments;

(vi) the duration of each temporary duty assignment; and

(vii) the cost of each temporary duty assignment.

(B) SOUTHWEST BORDER.—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall identify, with respect to each of the statistics described in clauses (i) through (vii) of such subparagraph, information relating to preventing or responding to illegal entries along the southwest border of the United States, including the costs relating to temporary redeployments along the southwest border.

(C) NOTICE.—Not later than 10 days before redeploying employees from 1 port of entry to another, absent emergency circumstances—

(i) the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall notify the director of the port of entry from which employees will be reassigned of the intended redeployments; and

(ii) the port director shall notify impacted facilities (including airports, seaports, and land ports) of the intended redeployments.

(D) STAFF BRIEFING.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, in consultation with the Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations, shall brief all affected U.S. Customs and Border Protection employees regarding plans to mitigate vulnerabilities created by any planned staffing reductions at ports of entry.

(2) REIMBURSABLE SERVICES AGREEMENTS QUARTERLY REPORT.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit a quarterly report to the appropriate congressional committees regarding the use of reimbursable service agreements by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, which shall include—

(A) the governmental or private entities with an active reimbursable service agreement, including the locations at which the contracted services are being performed;

(B) a description of the factors that were considered before entering into each of the active reimbursable service agreements referred to in subparagraph (A);

(C) the number of hours that U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers worked during the reporting period in fulfillment of responsibilities agreed to under each of the reimbursable service agreements; and

(D) the total costs incurred by U.S. Customs and Border Protection relating to each reimbursable service agreement, including the amount of such costs that were reimbursed by the contracted entity.

(3) ANNUAL WORKLOAD STAFFING MODEL REPORT.—As part of the Annual Report on Staffing required under section 411(g)(5)(A) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 211(g)(5)(A)), the Commissioner shall include—

(A) information concerning the progress made toward meeting the Office of Field Operations officer and support staff hiring targets set forth in subsection (b), while accounting for attrition;

(B) an update to the information provided in the Resource Optimization at the Ports of Entry report, which was submitted to Congress on September 12, 2017, pursuant to the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2017 (division F of Public Law 115–31); and

(C) a summary of the information included in the quarterly reports required under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(4) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

(1) $80,908,929 for fiscal year 2020; and

(2) $97,132,268 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2026.

SA 835. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 589. HONORARY PROMOTION OF COLONEL CHARLES E. MCGEE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL IN THE AIR FORCE.

The President is authorized to issue an appropriate honorary commission promoting to brigadier general in the Air Force Colonel Charles E. McGee, United States Air Force (retired), a distinguished Tuskegee Airman whose honorary promotion has the recommendation of the Secretary of the Air Force in accordance with the provisions section 1563 of title 10, United States Code.

SA 836. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 5546 the following:

SEC. 5547. LIMITATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH SEPARATIONS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO SUFFER FROM MENTAL HEALTH CONDITIONS IN CONNECTION WITH A SEX-RELATED, INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE-RELATED, OR SPOUSAL-ABUSE OFFENSE.

(a) CONFIRMATION OF DIAGNOSIS OF CONDITION REQUIRED BEFORE SEPARATION.—Before a member of the Armed Forces who was the victim of a sex-related offense, an intimate partner violence-related offense, or a spousal-abuse offense during service in the Armed Forces (whether or not such offense was committed by another member of the Armed Forces), and who has a mental health condition not amounting to a physical disability, is separated, discharged, or released from the Armed Forces based solely on such condition, the diagnosis of such condition must be—

(1) corroborated by a competent mental health care professional at the peer level or a higher level of the health care professional making the diagnosis; and

(2) endorsed by the Surgeon General of the military department concerned.

(b) NARRATIVE REASON FOR SEPARATION IF MENTAL HEALTH CONDITION PRESENT.—If the narrative reason for discharge, separation, or release from the Armed Forces of a member of the Armed Forces is a mental health condition that is not a disability, the appropriate narrative reason for the discharge, separation, or release shall be condition, not a disability, or Secretarial authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section:

(1) The term ''intimate partner violence-related offense'' means the following:

(A) An offense under section 928 or 930 of title 10, United States Code (article 128 or 130 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(B) An offense under State law for conduct identical or substantially similar to an offense described in subparagraph (A).

(2) The term ''sex-related offense'' means the following:

(A) An offense under section 920 or 920b of title 10, United States Code (article 120 or 120b of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(B) An offense under State law for conduct identical or substantially similar to an offense described in subparagraph (A).

(3) The term ''spousal-abuse offense'' means the following:

(A) An offense under section 928 of title 10, United States Code (article 128 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(B) An offense under State law for conduct identical or substantially similar to an offense described in subparagraph (A).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to separations, discharges, and releases from the Armed Forces that occur on or after that effective date.

SA 837. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. BLOCKING FENTANYL IMPORTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Blocking Deadly Fentanyl Imports Act''.

(b) AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF MAJOR ILLICIT DRUG PRODUCING COUNTRY.—Section 481(e)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''in which'';

(2) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''in which'' before ''1,000'';

(3) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting ''in which'' before ''1,000''; and

(B) by striking ''or'' at the end;

(4) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting ''in which'' before ''5,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) that is a significant source of illicit synthetic opioids and related illicit precursors significantly affecting the United States;''.

(c) INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL STRATEGY REPORT.—Section 489(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) A separate section that contains the following:

''(A) An identification of the countries, to the extent feasible, that are the most significant sources of illicit fentanyl and fentanyl analogues significantly affecting the United States during the preceding calendar year.

''(B) A description of the extent to which each country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) has cooperated with the United States to prevent the articles or chemicals described in subparagraph (A) from being exported from such country to the United States.

''(C) A description of whether each country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) has adopted and utilizes scheduling or other procedures for illicit drugs that are similar in effect to the procedures authorized under title II of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 811 et seq.) for adding drugs and other substances to the controlled substances schedules;

''(D) A description of whether each country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) is following steps to prosecute individuals involved in the illicit manufacture or distribution of controlled substance analogues (as defined in section 102(32) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(32)); and

''(E) A description of whether each country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) requires the registration of tableting machines and encapsulating machines or other measures similar in effect to the registration requirements set forth in part 1310 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, and has not made good faith efforts, in the opinion of the Secretary, to improve regulation of tableting machines and encapsulating machines.''.

(d) WITHHOLDING OF BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 490(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or country identified pursuant to clause (i) or (ii) of section 489(a)(8)(A) of this Act'' and inserting ''country identified pursuant to section 489(a)(8)(A), or country twice identified pursuant to section 489(a)(9)(A)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or major drug-transit country (as determined under subsection (h)) or country identified pursuant to clause (i) or (ii) of section 489(a)(8)(A) of this Act'' and inserting '', major drug-transit country, country identified pursuant to section 489(a)(8)(A), or country twice identified pursuant to section 489(a)(9)(A)''.

(2) DESIGNATION OF ILLICIT FENTANYL COUNTRIES WITHOUT SCHEDULING PROCEDURES.—Section 706(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j–1(2)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''also'';

(B) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (E);

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) designate each country, if any, identified under section 489(a)(9) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h(a)(9)) that has failed to adopt and utilize scheduling procedures for illicit drugs that are comparable to the procedures authorized under title II of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 811 et seq.) for adding drugs and other substances to the controlled substances schedules;''; and

(E) in subparagraph (E), as redesignated, by striking ''so designated'' and inserting ''designated under subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D)''.

(3) DESIGNATION OF ILLICIT FENTANYL COUNTRIES WITHOUT ABILITY TO PROSECUTE CRIMINALS FOR THE MANUFACTURE OR DISTRIBUTION OF FENTANYL ANALOGUES.—Section 706(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j–1(2)), as amended by paragraph (2), is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) designate each country, if any, identified under section 489(a)(9) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h(a)(9)) that has not taken significant steps to prosecute individuals involved in the illicit manufacture or distribution of controlled substance analogues (as defined in section 102(32) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(32));''.

(4) DESIGNATION OF ILLICIT FENTANYL COUNTRIES THAT DO NOT REQUIRE THE REGISTRATION OF PILL PRESSES AND TABLETING MACHINES.—Section 706(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j–1(2)), as amended by paragraphs (2) and (3), is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) designate each country, if any, identified under section 489(a)(9) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h(a)(9)) that—

''(i) does not require the registration of tableting machines and encapsulating machines in a manner comparable to the registration requirements set forth in part 1310 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations; and

''(ii) has not made good faith efforts (in the opinion of the Secretary) to improve the regulation of tableting machines and encapsulating machines; and''.

(5) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGNATED COUNTRIES.—Section 706(3) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j–1(3)) is amended by striking ''also designated under paragraph (2) in the report'' and inserting ''designated in the report under paragraph (2)(A) or twice designated in the report under subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (2)''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 838. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1086. ANNUAL REPORTS ON FEDERAL PROJECTS THAT ARE OVER BUDGET AND BEHIND SCHEDULE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''covered agency'' means—

(A) an Executive agency, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) an independent regulatory agency, as defined in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(2) The term ''project'' includes any program, project, or activity other that a program, project, or activity funded by mandatory spending.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress and post on the website of the Office of Management and Budget a report on each project funded by a covered agency (other than a program currently subject to reporting requirements under section 2433 of title 10 United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Nunn-McCurdy Amendment''))—

(1) that is more than 5 years behind schedule; or

(2) for which the amount spent on the project is not less than $1,000,000,000 more than the original cost estimate for the project.

(c) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted and posted under subsection (b) shall include, for each project included in the report—

(1) a brief description of the project, including—

(A) the purpose of the project;

(B) each location in which the project is carried out;

(C) the year in which the project was initiated;

(D) the Federal share of the total cost of the project; and

(E) each primary contractor, subcontractor, grant recipient, and subgrantee recipient of the project;

(2) an explanation of any change to the original scope of the project, including by the addition or narrowing of the initial requirements of the project;

(3) the original expected date for completion of the project;

(4) the current expected date for completion of the project;

(5) the original cost estimate for the project, as adjusted to reflect increases in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics;

(6) the current cost estimate for the project, as adjusted to reflect increases in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics;

(7) an explanation for a delay in completion or increase in the original cost estimate for the project; and

(8) the amount of and rationale for any award, incentive fee, or other type of bonus, if any, awarded for the project.

(d) SUBMISSION WITH BUDGET.—Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(40) the report required under section 1086(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 for the calendar year ending in the fiscal year in which the budget is submitted.''.

SA 839. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military

activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 705. CHIROPRACTIC HEALTH CARE SERVICES FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR CERTAIN COVERED BENEFICIARIES.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall complete development of a plan to provide chiropractic health care services and benefits for eligible covered beneficiaries as a permanent part of the TRICARE program.

(b) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—The plan developed under subsection (a) shall require that a contract entered into under section 1097 of title 10, United States Code, for the delivery of health care services shall—

(1) include the delivery of chiropractic services to eligible covered beneficiaries;

(2) require that chiropractic services may be provided only by a doctor of chiropractic; and

(3) provide that an eligible covered beneficiary may select and have direct access to a doctor of chiropractic without referral by another health practitioner.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN.—The plan developed under subsection (a) shall provide for implementation of the plan to begin not later than 60 days after the date on which the plan is completed.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''chiropractic services''—

(A) includes diagnosis (including by diagnostic x-ray tests), evaluation and management, and therapeutic services for the treatment of a patient's health condition, including neuromusculoskeletal conditions and the subluxation complex, and such other services determined appropriate by the Secretary of Defense and as authorized under State law; and

(B) does not include the use of drugs or surgery.

(2) The term ''covered beneficiary'' has the meaning given that term in section 1072(5) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The term ''eligible covered beneficiary'' means a covered beneficiary excluding a dependent of a member or former member of a uniformed service.

(4) The term ''dependent'' has the meaning given that term in section 1072(2) of title 10, United States Code.

(5) The term ''doctor of chiropractic'' means only a doctor of chiropractic who is licensed as a doctor of chiropractic, chiropractic physician, or chiropractor by a State, the District of Columbia, or a territory or possession of the United States.

(6) The term ''TRICARE program'' has the meaning given that term in section 1072(7) of title 10, United States Code.

SA 840. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. _____. REPORT ON USE OF ENCRYPTION BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing the mission need and efficacy of full disk encryption across NIPRNET and SIPRNET endpoint computer systems, including the cost, mission impact, and implementation timeline.

SA 841. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 764 submitted by Mr. INHOFE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Section 5211 is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 5211. DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION STRATEGY TO PROCURE SECURE, LOW PROBABILITY OF DETECTION DATA LINK NETWORK CAPABILITY.

The text of subsections (a) through (c) of section 211 are hereby deemed to read as follows:

''(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—Not later than April 1, 2020, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff of the Army shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a joint development and acquisition strategy to procure a secure, low probability of detection data link network capability, with the ability to effectively operate in hostile jamming environments while preserving the low observability characteristics of the relevant platforms, including both existing and planned platforms.

''(b) NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS.—The data link network capability to be procured pursuant to the development and acquisition strategy submitted under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) ensure that any network made with such capability will be low risk and affordable, with minimal impact or change to existing host platforms and minimal overall integration costs;

''(2) use a non-proprietary and open systems approach compatible with the Rapid Capabilities Office Open Mission Systems initiative of the Air Force and the Future Airborne Capability Environment initiative of the Navy; and

''(3) provide for an architecture to connect, with operationally relevant throughput and latency—

''(A) fifth-generation combat aircraft;

''(B) fifth-generation and fourth-generation combat aircraft;

''(C) fifth-generation and fourth-generation combat aircraft and appropriate support aircraft and other network nodes for command, control, communications, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance purposes; and

''(D) fifth-generation and fourth-generation combat aircraft and their associated network-enabled precision weapons.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2020 for operations and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, for operations and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Navy, and for operations and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Army, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the date that is 15 days after the date on which the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff of the Army submit the development and acquisition strategy required by subsection (a).''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 20, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 20, 2019, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Robert Wallace, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 20, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 20, 2019, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Andrew P. Bremberg, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador, Philip S. Goldberg, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Colombia, Doug Manchester, of California, to be Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas, Adrian Zuckerman, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to Romania, Richard B. Norland, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to Libya, Jonathan R. Cohen, of California, to be Ambassador to the Arab Republic of Egypt, and John Rakolta, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates, all of the Department of State, and other pending nominations.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 20, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Peter Joseph Phipps, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit

Judge for the Third Circuit, Mary S. McElroy, to be United States District Judge for the District of Rhode Island, Gary Richard Brown, Diane Gujarati, Eric Ross Komitee, and Rachel P. Kovner, each to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, Stephanie Dawkins Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, Stephanie A. Gallagher, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, Charles R. Eskridge Ill, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Lewis J. Liman, and Mary Kay Vyskocil, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Martha Maria Pacold, Mary M. Rowland, and Steven C. Seeger, each to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Jason K. Pulliam, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, John L. Sinatra, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, William Shaw Stickman IV, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Frank William Volk, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of West Virginia, Jennifer Philpott Wilson, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, David Austin Tapp, of Kentucky, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, and Edward W. Felten, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 20, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURING, TRADE, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

The Subcommittee on Manufacturing, Trade, and Consumer Protection of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 05, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that John-Rex Spivey, a Navy fellow in Senator COLLINS's office, be granted floor privileges through January 31, 2020.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns from the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee staff have privileges of the floor through July 31, 2019. Their names are Emma Runge, Kelsey Lessard, and Peter St. Amand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 257, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 257) designating June 20, 2019, as ''American Eagle Day'' and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 257) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 2019 AS ''NATIONAL BRAIN TUMOR AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 258, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 258) expressing support for the designation of May 2019 as ''National Brain Tumor Awareness Month.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 258) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

WORLD ELDER ABUSE AWARENESS DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 242.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 242) designating June 15, 2019, as ''World Elder Abuse Awareness Day.''

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 242) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 10, 2019, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS LONG-TERM LEGAL RESIDENTS RELIEF ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 559.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 559) to amend section 6 of the Joint Resolution entitled ''A Joint Resolution to approve the Covenant To Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the bill?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 559) was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 24, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, June 24; further, that following the prayer and

pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1790 under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 24, 2019, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:57 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 24, 2019, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 20, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

SETH DANIEL APPLETON, OF MISSOURI, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DINO FALASCHETTI, OF MONTANA, TO BE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF FINANCIAL RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

ROBERT HUNTER KURTZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BIMAL PATEL, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

RITA BARANWAL, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (NUCLEAR ENERGY).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KEITH KRACH, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENERGY, AND THE ENVIRONMENT).

EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

KEITH KRACH, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

KEITH KRACH, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS; UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTER–AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JEFFREY L. EBERHARDT, OF WISCONSIN, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PRESIDENT FOR NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

ALLISON HERREN LEE, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2022.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE 2019 CONGRESSIONAL ART COMPETITION WINNER FROM TEXAS' 11TH DISTRICT

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2019 Congressional Art Competition winner from Texas' 11th District, Ms. Rylee Braden. Rylee's piece was chosen to be displayed in the tunnels under the U.S. Capitol, where Members of Congress, staff, and visitors from around the country can view and appreciate it for a full year.

Rylee is a very accomplished senior at Wall High School where she excels in academics, athletics, and art. Her drawing titled ''Mamaw Molded Me'' depicts the time-worn, loving hands of her grandmother that she drew using charcoal and colored pencils.

Rylee's Mamaw, Rosalie Sturm, told me that although she has always wanted to, she has never had the opportunity to visit Washington, D.C. Now through her granddaughter's rendering of her hands, a little piece of her will not only travel to Washington but will be displayed in the Capitol itself. I am proud to have the 11th District represented by a piece that speaks to the wisdom that is passed down through generations and the impact of a loving parent and grandparent.

Again, I congratulate Rylee on her achievement and look forward to seeing her art every day when I walk to and from the Capitol.

TRIBUTE TO THE GAY MEN'S CHORUS OF LOS ANGELES

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Gay Men's Chorus of Los Angeles upon its 40th Anniversary.

In July of 1979, the Gay Men's Chorus of Los Angeles (GMCLA) was formed when ninety-nine men stepped up at the Plummer Park Community Center in West Hollywood, having seen posters announcing the formation and first rehearsal of a new gay chorus. Three months later, the chorus performed at the National March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights, thus marking the beginning of their important legacy.

Throughout their forty-year history, GMCLA members have used their comradery and shared experiences to challenge stereotypes and enrich the community. At the height of the AIDS epidemic, the GMCLA family lost 150 members, but even that horrific tragedy did not stop their work and their commitment to celebrate and serve the LGBTQ community. The GMCLA has since become an essential part of the fabric of Los Angeles, with members dedicating their time to advocating for equality through song and community service.

The GMCLA has stayed true to its core message of equality by transforming and nurturing the Los Angeles and LGBTQ communities through its initiatives, such as the Alive Music Project. The multi-faceted project, which has reached over 65,000 middle and high school students, promotes acceptance and anti-bullying, and provides opportunities for music education programs in Los Angeles schools. Additionally, the GMCLA is a proud member of The Arts for Incarcerated Youth Network which offers music education to juvenile detention center students. Through these initiatives, the GMCLA reaches countless youth.

Today, the GMCLA boasts over 300 members and has performed in iconic venues around the world, including Walt Disney Concert Hall, the Hollywood Bowl, and Carnegie Hall in New York. With each new venue, they sing for a world that promotes acceptance and is free from discrimination. The Gay Men's Chorus of Los Angeles will honor its anniversary and the 50th Anniversary of the Stonewall uprising in August, when they will be joined by the New York City Gay Men's Chorus for a historic concert and gala to benefit their music education programs.

I am proud to recognize the Gay Men's Chorus of Los Angeles for four decades of musical entertainment and outstanding service to the LGBTQ and Los Angeles communities. I ask all members to join me in congratulating the Gay Men's Chorus of Los Angeles for its remarkable achievements.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MAX ROSE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, during Roll Call Vote number 341 on H.R. 2740, I mistakenly recorded my vote as No when I should have voted Yes.

CASE OF MR. MICHAEL NGUYEN

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I stand here today in support of Michael Phuong Minh Nguyen—a proud American citizen, a loving husband to Helen Nguyen, and a doting father of four young daughters.

However, it saddens me deeply that Mr. Nguyen has been unjustly detained by the Vietnamese government for over eleven months now—nearly a year—which has caused immense suffering for his family and his entire community.

Mr. Nguyen was arrested on July 7, 2018 while visiting relatives in Vietnam, detained without official charges, and is only now finally to stand trial next week on June 24, 2019 in Ho Chi Minh City.

Mr. Nguyen has been an upstanding, model citizen of the United States for some 40 years and, to my knowledge, has no criminal record.

In fact, he is an entrepreneur and a small business owner.

He is also a man of faith and is actively involved in his local community church.

One of our most sacred duties as elected officials is to protect our citizens from harm—on both domestic and foreign soil—and indeed I have never given up on my constituents even after they have been deported or detained abroad.

This is why, since his detention last year, I have consistently urged, to both the United States and Vietnamese governments, swift action be taken to expeditiously return Mr. Michael Nguyen home.

I am tremendously grateful to my colleagues in both chambers and on both sides of the aisle for their tireless advocacy on behalf of Mr. Nguyen and his family.

Madam Speaker, I close by respectfully imploring the Vietnamese government to do the right thing—ensure a fair trial, a speedy resolution, and justice for Michael Nguyen.

MELISSA SANTA CRUZ APPRECIATION DAY

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Melissa Santa Cruz in honor of her day of appreciation as enacted by the City of South Tucson, Arizona. A pillar of the local airwaves, Ms. Santa Cruz has accomplished just as much in her community as she has on the radio. Her driving passion both in her work and activism has endeared her to all of her many listeners.

With over 30 years as an on-air personality, Santa Cruz began her career in the town of Globe, Arizona, on the country music station KQSS 98.3 FM. She eventually moved back to the Tucson area, being a featured personality across many broadcast stations, and bringing music of all genres to the listeners of Southern Arizona. In her current role, Santa Cruz now serves as Program Director for Tejano 1600AM, while continuing on as a country and adult contemporary radio DJ on 97.1 The Bull and My 92.9, respectively.

A daughter of former South Tucson Councilman Reynaldo Santa Cruz, Melissa has always known the value of community. As a young girl, Santa Cruz saw both her father as well as her mother Lydia volunteer as members of Santa Cruz Church Parish, and has continued their work into her professional life. Santa Cruz has made it a point to keep her

community up to date on local benefits and functions, making a point to highlight families and non-profit organizations in need. She not only talks the talk, but walks the walk, and has emceed events for various Latinx organizations such as Chicanos Por La Causa, LULAC, and the League of Mexican American Women.

Melissa Santa Cruz has truly indebted herself to the City of South Tucson and to Southern Arizona as a whole. She truly serves as an inspiration to our community, broadcasting the music of the Borderlands across Tejano 1600AM while also being proactive on issues of importance to all Southern Arizonans. I am proud to stand here on the floor today on Melissa Santa Cruz Appreciation Day, in recognition of Melissa Santa Cruz as one of our community's most valuable citizens.

RECOGNITION OF THE MARCHING COBRAS FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Marching Cobras. It is my distinct honor to congratulate this prestigious drill team on fifty years of success. Throughout my public life, I have been pleased to see this organization grow in number and recognition.

In a time when Kansas City was experiencing a lull in our rich and vibrant music scene, the Marching Cobras provided vitality and energy by enthusiastically marching in the style of Mr. Willie Arthur Smith. They played a pivotal role in maintaining our city's reputation as a musical and cultural hub . It is my great pleasure to recognize the Marching Cobras' students and leaders, past, present, and future. Their dedication has made this organization what it is today. The Marching Cobras reflect the vibrant community they represent and add bright colors to the rich historical fabric of Kansas City.

Concerned with the lack of productive activities available to students, Mr. Willie Arthur Smith saw an opportunity to provide his community with the means to both keep students off the streets and share his passion for marching. While teaching at Lincoln Junior High, Smith taught a group of his students a dance called the Madison Line for an all-student talent show. This simple act marked the birth of the Marching Cobras. Since 1969, the Marching Cobras have risen to a place of international recognition and continue their legacy of excellence. They have won national competitions and performed in events like the American Royal and the Cotton Bowl. They have even played prestigious venues from Nice, France to the White House.

With every performance, the Marching Cobras act as ambassadors of Kansas City and represent our city with pride. The dedication of the students and leaders shows a devotion to constant, beneficial improvement. It is this demonstration of excellence that engenders a desire for progress in every community that the Marching Cobras touch. I look forward to seeing the Marching Cobras' legacy continue to grow. They provide students with a means for accomplishment and gaining valuable skills. If it were not for people like Willie Arthur Smith and other Marching Cobra leaders, hundreds of students would not have the ability to participate in this vibrant and meaningful experience.

Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring the Marching Cobras' fiftieth anniversary of bringing music, pride, and recognition to the community. On behalf of myself and the entire Fifth Congressional District of Missouri, it is my joy to congratulate the Marching Cobras on this significant milestone and wish them even greater success in the years to come.

CELEBRATING THE CAREER OF JEANNETTE FRANK AT THE ARC OF SCHUYLER

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the service of Jeannette Frank to The Arc of Schuyler and congratulate her on her retirement.

Jeannette Frank has dedicated her career to The Arc of Schuyler, beginning nearly forty years ago as an Outreach Worker. Jeannette joined The Arc shortly after its formation in 1978, and has dedicated her career to aid families and their loved ones with disabilities. Her commitment to those supported by The Arc of Schuyler and their families has been an inspiration, both to her team at The Arc and the community as a whole.

For the last eight years, Jeannette has served as the Executive Director of The Arc of Schuyler. Her dedication and hard work have ensured the high quality of services that The Arc provides to people with disabilities. She has not only advanced community-based services such the Schuyler County Transit and Transportation Link-Line, but also social enterprises operated by The Arc such as Franklin Street Gallery and Gift Shop and Glen Copack.

As Jeannette moves forward with the next chapter of her life, we applaud her tireless efforts to improve the quality of life for people in Schuyler County and we wish her all the best in her retirement.

Given the above, I ask that this Legislative Body pause in its deliberations and join me to celebrate Jeannette Frank and her extraordinary career.

RECOGNIZING JUNE AS ALZHEIMER & BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, June is Alzheimer's & Brain Awareness Month and I rise today to share with this chamber the impact Alzheimer's Disease has had on my family. Today, 5.8 million Americans live with brain disease. I have witnessed firsthand the burdens of these illnesses because my father, Andrew Katko, lived with Alzheimer's for nearly a decade before passing away a few months ago.

My family was faced with the difficult decision on how to care for our father during this time in his life. This is not uncommon among families after a brain disease diagnosis.

Often, family and friends are primary caretakers for those suffering with Alzheimer's and dementia. My mother, Mary Lou, served as my father's primary caregiver, joining the 16 million Americans who provide unpaid care. This year, unpaid caregivers will provide 18.5 billion hours of care valued at $234 billion.

The BOLD Infrastructure for Alzheimer's Act was signed into law last Congress and is now being implemented. This legislation authorizes the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to research prevention methods for dementias, establish local treatment facilities, and provide better resources to caregivers. I am committed to passing additional policies that improve the lives of those living with dementias.

HONORING TUCSON'S NATIONAL HISTORY DAY WINNERS

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Tucson, Arizona's four students who won first place at the National Endowment for the Humanities' National History Day contest. The young history buffs, Sean Choudhry, Elias Rice-Bensch, Zia Rice-Bensch, and Keona Wallen all attend the Accelerated Learning Laboratory in my district. Their website Radium Girls: From Jaw-Dropping Tragedy to Glowing Triumph earned the top prize in the contest that featured more than 3,000 students from across the country.

National History Day began in the 1970s and is the culmination of a yearlong academic program for students in grades 6 through 12 to engage in historical research. Students produce essays, exhibitions, films, performances, or websites to enter into local and state competitions. State winners move on to compete in the national finals at the University of Maryland at College Park. The National Endowment for the Humanities has been a sponsor and partner of National History Day for more than 30 years.

The theme for this year's competition was ''Triumph and Tragedy in History'' and more than a half million students submitted entries. On their website, Sean, Elias, Zia, and Keona state, ''The radium girls were young factory workers who unknowingly consumed lethal amounts of radium, often resulting in slow, painful deaths. Despite their tragic circumstances, their desire for change and persistence in court caused revolutionary change to workplace safety regulations and sparked monumental scientific advancements regarding radium and radioactivity.''

The students go on to document how radium was commonly used and recommended. At the focus of their website is the story of the women who, at the start of the 20th century, were exposed to high levels of radium in their work as they painted watch dials. Such exposure proved quickly fatal and resulted in physical deformities and cancer. The legal battles that followed were tumultuous and provided minor relief for the women who had been exposed to radium. Their legacy, however, lives

on today as workplace protections continue to be a focus on Capitol Hill.

These four incredible students have demonstrated truly admirable talent and skill in their deep dive into history. I am moved by their desire to shed light on an overlooked and long-forgotten story that still resonates today. I want to congratulate Sean, Elias, Zia, Keona, their families, and the educators who have helped them get where they are today. I expect great things from each of them in the near future and look forward to the positive impact they will have on our district and abroad.

CONGRATULATING BLAIR OAKS' BASEBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2019 CLASS II STATE BASEBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Blair Oaks Falcons Baseball team for winning the 2019 Missouri Class III State Baseball Championship.

This team and Coach Mike DeMilia, should be commended for their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community. This is Blair Oaks' third state championship win in the history of their baseball program.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the Blair Oaks Falcons Baseball team for a job well done.

IN HONOR OF MR. HARRY WATKINS

HON. DAVID ROUZER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the life of the late Mr. Harry Watkins of Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina. An architect for more than 40 years, Harry Watkins left a lasting imprint on Wrightsville Beach, Bald Head Island, Figure 8 Island and many other surrounding communities.

Harry got his start in architecture after studying at North Carolina State University, and went on to design many of the homes that still stand there today. He always held a special place in his heart for Bald Head Island.

Harry helped to grow Wrightsville Beach true to his vision:

''The architect must understand the community, the environment, and especially the characteristics of the specific site,'' Harry said of his design philosophy. He described his idea of what a good home can be as ''a joy when things were going well, and a comfort when they were not.''

Harry passed away late last year, at the age of 72. He left behind a legacy of architectural vision and excellence. Even more importantly, he is survived by his wife Vicki, his daughter Brooke, and an entire community of friends, neighbors and clients. Wrightsville Beach will be forever grateful for his passion for his community.

HONORING THE EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE OF DEVRATH IYER

HON. ANDY BIGGS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an accomplished student from Chandler, Arizona. Devrath Iyer was selected as one of fifty-two students to attend the annual Research Science Institute (RSI) sponsored by the Center for Excellence in Education in collaboration with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Each summer, RSI gathers a small group of talented students to participate in an intensive on-and off-campus science and engineering summer program.

I have no doubt that Devrath and the other young leaders selected to participate in this program will excel in service to their schools and communities. Devrath's dedication to educational excellence and hard work is an example for all of us to emulate. I am honored to have such talent and motivation in my district.

IN RECOGNITION OF HAYDEN CORPORATION'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Hayden Corporation of West Springfield, Massachusetts on its 100th year of business. Now in its fourth generation of family ownership, the Hayden Corporation represents the robust character and history of economic innovation in western Massachusetts. It is my pleasure to recognize them on this significant milestone.

Hayden Corporation was founded by Charles E. Hayden in 1919. At that time, the company's business was weaving and installing wire cloth used in the paper industry. Hayden Corp. eventually grew to start building, installing, and servicing other paper-making equipment under the leadership of Charles' son, Charles Wesley ''Wes'' Hayden. Wes also developed a patented process for seamlessly welding stainless steel wire cloth. Today, Hayden Corp. still services the paper making industry with field teams working on machinery in mills up and down the east coast of the United States. But the last 100 years has also seen Hayden Corp. diversify and expand to an enviable extent. Retired company president John O. Hayden, as well as his son and current president Daniel C. Hayden, spearheaded the corporation into state-of-the-art coating of parts for the paper and pulp industry, power generation, gas and oil exploration and extraction, military applications, and the plastics industry. One of Hayden Corporation's customers has even been the U.S. Navy, when the company coated a valve on the submarine U.S.S. *Springfield* and its sister boats. Hayden Corporation's success and longevity is a testament to not only the Hayden family and the company's dedicated employees, but also the city of West Springfield and the overarching American manufacturing story of the entire region.

Once again Madam Speaker, over the course of its 100-year history, Hayden Corporation has demonstrated exemplary leadership and integrity. Those traits are hallmarks of the company's outstanding work in western Massachusetts and beyond, and are certainly worthy of recognition. On the occasion of Hayden Corporation's 100th anniversary, I wish the Hayden family and the individuals who work with them—some for decades—all the best and much continued prosperity.

SANDY OXFORD

HON. KEVIN HERN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the retirement of Sandy Oxford and thank this outstanding Oklahoman for her service to my community.

Ms. Oxford served as an Army clerk during the Vietnam era, eventually switching to the Navy where she was one of their top recruiters.

Back home in Tulsa, she served as the office manager for the Tulsa Vet Center. Additionally, Ms. Oxford faithfully served as the chair of the Mayor of Tulsa's Veteran Advisory Council. She served in this role with great dedication for 10 years, never missing a single meeting.

She has worked tirelessly to improve the lives of veterans, including work on suicide prevention initiatives and Vietnam Veteran commemoration ceremonies.

To thank Ms. Oxford for her service, Tulsa's Mayor Bynum presented her a key to the city and declared May 16th ''Sandy Oxford Day'' in Tulsa.

I am honored to recognize Sandy Oxford as she attends her final meeting of the advisory council today. Her commitment to the City of Tulsa will not soon be forgotten.

CONGRATULATING GABE KURTZ OF THE CAMDENTON LAKERS FOR WINNING THE 2019 MISSOURI CLASS IV STATE JAVELIN THROW TITLE

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Gabe Kurtz of the Camdenton High School Lakers for winning the 2019 Missouri Class IV State Javelin Throw Title. This is the second year in a row Gabe has won the state championship title.

Gabe and Coach Nick Bruck, should be commended for their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state title to their school and community.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing Gabe Kurtz for a job well done.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

SPEECH OF

HON. ROGER W. MARSHALL

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 2019

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes:

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Chair, I rise today because American farmers, grain handlers and exporters, as well as their customers around the world, depend on accurate, timely and cost-effective delivery of mandated impartial third-party Official inspection and weighing services administered by the Federal Grain Inspection Service (FGIS) and its designated and delegated agencies. It is essential that the U.S. Official grain inspection and weighing system be recognized widely around the world for its impartial, consistent, reliable and timely measurement and certification of quality attributes and weights. The availability of accurate FGIS inspection results is also important to enable buyers and sellers to determine grain value and to facilitate market price discovery. Further, Official export inspections provide transparency and market information to the entire value chain that contribute to an efficient marketplace, while supporting food security and sustainable supplies.

I share the concerns of many of my colleagues about language included in the committee report by the Majority for H.R. 3055 that puts Congress in the middle of an ongoing labor dispute, even going so far as to urge that USDA not require its grain inspectors to cross a picket line. This language is extremely troubling, and Congress should not be including it in any final committee report for the Agriculture Appropriations bill. Thankfully, the Minority was able to include its concerns about the situation which I would like to include in the RECORD:

"In addition to overall funding concerns, Republican Members of the Committee were disappointed by several policy provisions. Some of the provisions encourage violation of federal law or Congressional intent, at a minimum. For example, the Majority included language under the heading of the Office of the Secretary relating to Grain Export Inspection. The language "strongly discourages USDA from requiring its grain inspectors to cross a picket line". Such language is irresponsible when the Grain Inspections Act clearly obligates inspectors to conduct inspections unless the Secretary were to waive the requirement for safety reasons. Using USDA inspectors in a labor dispute and interfering with the export sales of U.S. product during an already turbulent international trade environment is completely unnecessary."

Our producers, grain handlers, and the agricultural value chain as a whole has worked tirelessly to grow market share around the world and Congress should refrain from instructing USDA not to perform important services that are statutorily obligated under the Grain Standards Act.

IN APPRECIATION OF MARK BENSON'S WORK IN IDAHO

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a great friend to Idaho, Mark Benson, who is retiring after a 42 year career with PotlatchDeltic. The last 13 years he has been Vice President, Public Affairs. However, his title to me is a friend and trusted advisor.

I met Mark when I was in the Idaho Legislature. He quickly established himself as a valuable advisor on forestry and paper products which is a large economic driver in Idaho. Mark has the unique ability to explain an issue and the impacts from every perspective and gives always gives an honest assessment of the status.

Mark worked at nearly every level of PotlatchDeltic, starting as a field forester in 1974. He has left his mark on the industry and will be remembered for founding the National Alliance of Forest Owners who is a leading voice on all the issues facing forestry.

Mark has been a great friend to my staff and me. To Mark, PotlatchDeltic was not just a job, it was a lifestyle and he treated his colleagues like family. Mark is also an incredible husband and father as witnessed by his supportive wife Patti and three amazing daughters who now have families of their own. No doubt, this will be the focal point of his retirement alongside his many hobbies including golf, hunting, and travel.

If I have one gripe with Mark, it is that he never let me win on the golf course. As kind and generous as he is, he could never seem to find it in his heart to let a putt or two slide by. Perhaps I will be able to change that now that he has more time to hit the links.

I wish Mark and Patti and the rest of their family a terrific and well-deserved retirement. I look forward to keeping in touch with him as a friend and seeing him back in Idaho.

HONORING LINDA TAVASZI, PH.D.

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Linda Tavaszi, Ph.D., as she receives Marin Community Clinics' Lifetime Achievement Award for her decades of exemplary service promoting community health.

Born in Brooklyn, New York, in 1940, Dr. Tavaszi lived in Florida and Alabama before returning to New York to earn a graduate degree in social work from Fordham University. Dr. Tavaszi earned a masters in health administration from the University of Southern California, and a Ph.D. in health care administration from Walden University in Florida. Dr. Tavaszi began her life-long career in health care, most of which was spent working in Marin County.

Dr. Tavaszi came to Marin County as chief operating officer at Marin General Hospital in 1982. Under her leadership, Marin General opened a new emergency department and developed Marin's first and only cardiac surgery program. As president of the Health Council of Marin and the local chapter of the American Heart Association, Dr. Tavaszi's commitment and dedication to the community extended beyond her role at Marin General.

In 1994, Dr. Tavaszi was asked to oversee an American-owned hospital in Barcelona, Spain, where she and her family spent two years helping steer that project to success. Once back in California, Dr. Tavaszi oversaw the mergers of two hospitals in the East Bay, and she returned to Marin County as chief executive officer of Kentfield Rehabilitation Hospital. After great success there, she returned to Marin General in 2004. In 2011, Dr. Tavaszi became CEO of Marin Community Clinics. During her tenure at Marin Community Clinics, Dr. Tavaszi expanded patient capacity and comprehensive services for seniors and the homeless population. From 2017 to 2018 Dr. Tavaszi served as the chief executive officer of Ritter Center where she provided valuable assistance during a transition in leadership.

Madam Speaker, Dr. Tavaszi's career of leadership and vision has helped hospitals and clinics in our region provide affordable, high-quality health care to our most underserved populations. Therefore, please join me in recognizing Dr. Linda Tavaszi on her well-deserved honor and in wishing her the best of luck in her continuing pursuit of quality health care for people in need.

COMMEMORATION OF THE TREE OF PEACE

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the planting of the Tree of Peace on the grounds of the National World War I Museum and Memorial in Kansas City, Missouri. This ceremony is dignified by the presence of Mr. Ross P. Marine, the Honorary Consul of the Slovak Republic to the Midwest United States and board member of the Czech and Slovak Club of Greater Kansas City. During his eighteen-year tenure as Honorary Consul, Mr. Marine has worked to strengthen the economic, social, and cultural ties between Slovakia and Mid-America, and this spirit of international cooperation is reflected by the Tree of Peace project. Since the dedication of the National WWI Museum and Memorial on Armistice Day in 1926, Kansas City, Missouri has been home to the country's foremost institution committed to preserving the history of the First World War. In the shadows of the Liberty Memorial—the most fitting location our country offers for this project—the Tree of Peace will convey a message of goodwill and contribute to the reflective nature of this consecrated site.

Between July 28, 1914 and November 11, 1918, the First World War claimed the lives of nine million combatants and nearly eight million civilians. Another twenty-one million military personnel were wounded during the course of the war. In the United States alone, over 116,000 servicemen were killed, 204,000 were wounded, and 3,350 went missing. Among the American casualties, 441 were from Kansas City. To this day, World War I remains among the most costly and destructive wars in history.

When the National WWI Museum and Memorial opened to the public in 1926, President Calvin Coolidge explained that the memorial had ''not been raised to commemorate war and victory, but rather the results of war and victory, which are embodied in peace and liberty.'' The Tree of Peace project, initiated by Slovak landscape architect Dr. Marek Sabala, serves a similar purpose.

The Tree of Peace project is an international initiative that began in the Slovak Republic last year to mark the 100th anniversary of the First World War's conclusion. Within four years, Dr. Sabala hopes to plant a Tree of Peace on every continent, a mission designed to champion a message of peace and the need to avoid armed conflicts. Each Tree of Peace also stands as a living tribute to all those who fought and perished in World War I, including those who lost their lives on unknown battlefields and who remain known only God. So far, eight Trees of Peace have been planted in four participating countries: Austria, Slovakia, Russia, and Poland. With the planting of a Tree of Peace at the National WWI Museum and Memorial on June 21st, the United States will join this international community in hopes of achieving a world free from global conflict. At a National Historic Landmark that has attracted over two million visitors since 2006, the Tree of Peace will establish its roots at one of the most treasured sites in Missouri's Fifth Congressional District and the nation.

The motto of the Tree of Peace project, to ''make love the lifeblood of this world,'' articulates an ideal that is antithetical to the depravity of warfare. Visitors to the National WWI Museum and Memorial walk across a glass bridge above a field of 9,000 red poppies—each of which represents 1,000 combat deaths suffered during the War. Conversely, the Tree of Peace symbolizes belief in a future where war no longer inflicts senseless death on so many. World War I was described by many contemporaries as ''the war to end all wars.'' While the international community has repeatedly proven this description false—with graves all across the world bearing testament to the devastating consequences of armed conflict—the Tree of Peace expresses faith that we may, once and for all, see war come to an end.

The Liberty Memorial Tower is flanked by two Assyrian Sphinx sculptures, known as Memory and Future. While Memory shields its eyes from the horrors of war, and Future shields its eyes from the uncertainty of times to come, the Tree of Peace affirms hope in a future that need not cause one to cover one's eyes in fear.

The Tree of Peace project encourages each of us to recommit ourselves to the noble pursuit of perpetual peace—in which bullets, bombs, and bayonets are all set aside; hostility is replaced with civility; and antagonism gives way to amity. The Tree of Peace calls on nations to silence the beating of their war drums, cast away their rattling sabers, and pay no heed to war hawks. Only then will the ''just and lasting peace'' that is described on the north wall of the memorial become a reality.

Madam Speaker, please join me in celebrating the planting of the Tree of Peace at the National WWI Museum and Memorial in Kansas City, Missouri. Let us recognize this occasion by reflecting on the values of friendship, harmony, and goodwill.

CONGRATULATING ST. DOMINIC'S GIRLS SOCCER TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2019 CLASS III STATE SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the St. Dominic Crusaders Girls Soccer team for winning the 2019 Missouri Class III State Soccer Championship.

This team and Coach Greg Koeller, should be commended for their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community. This is the first state championship win for the girls' soccer team since 2013, with many more to come.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the St. Dominic Crusaders Girls Soccer team for a job well done.

IN RECOGNITION OF NEW JERSEY BUSINESS & INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION'S EMPLOYER LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES AND FRANK ROBINSON

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join with the New Jersey Business & Industry Association as they celebrate 60 years of Employer Legislative Committees and pay tribute to Frank Robinson for his 40 years of service to New Jersey. These incredible milestones and the New Jersey Business & Industry Association's efforts to support New Jersey businesses are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

With a 40-year career spanning the public, private and political sectors, Frank Robinson is a well-known and well-respected face in Trenton. He has served in leadership roles at the New Jersey Democratic State Committee and the New Jersey General Assembly, as well as the 2001 New Jersey Congressional Re-districting Commission. Currently serving as a Vice President of Government Affairs for the New Jersey Business & Industry Association (NJBIA) since 2002, Frank has been an effective voice for New Jersey's business community. He is the longstanding Executive Director of the State Employer Legislative Committees (ELCs) as well as Director of the NJBIA's Grassroots Network. He also serves as a member on the Monmouth-Ocean Development Group Board of Directors and as a Trustee of the Jersey Shore Partnership. Throughout his tenure with the NJBIA and beyond, Frank has distinguished himself as an advocate for the growth and viability of New Jersey.

Established by the NJBIA in 1959, today's eighteen ELCs provide local representation and accessibility to businesses in each county across the state. Hosting regular meetings, ELCs offer opportunities for business people to meet with local, state and Federal officials, hear directly from NJBIA's knowledgeable government affairs representatives and network with colleagues. ELCs provide an outlet for local businesses to discuss issues and learn about regulations and policies affecting their industry and employees.

For over 100 years, the NJBIA has represented the common interests of New Jersey's manufacturing and business industry. It continues to be a leading voice in New Jersey's state capital on industry affairs and an effective advocate on behalf of its members. Its information, programs and services are invaluable resources to companies and its understanding of laws and regulations help NJBIA members navigate the changing industry landscape. NJBIA's efforts to promote and expand New Jersey's business community are supported by its proficient and competent staff and the successful information sharing of its ELCs.

Madam Speaker, I sincerely hope my colleagues will join me in marking 60 years of Employer Legislative Committees and honoring Frank Robinson's 40 years of dedicated leadership to New Jersey.

IN RECOGNITION OF RANDOLPH GOODMAN

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVE

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career and service of Randolph Goodman. He recently retired after 26 years of work at Gary Job Corps.

Randolph Goodman was born and raised in Austin, Texas. In 1968, while attending The University of Texas at Arlington, he was inspired to join the Navy and serve his country after the assassination of Robert Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King.

After serving in the Navy for 20 years and completing his double major in history and political science, Mr. Goodman began working at Gary Job Corps as the Public Information Officer and Business Community Liaison.

The organization is dedicated to giving young adults access to free academic and technical career training. It puts young people on the path to the American dream through hard work and education. Not only does it set them up for economic success—it gives them the pride and purpose that comes from earning a diploma or technical certification and beginning a meaningful career. The San Marcos location, that Mr. Goodman served at, is the largest Job Corps Center in the State of Texas.

Throughout his 26 years at Gary Job Corps, he has traveled to Washington, D.C. to advocate for funding and ensure students have access to the resources they need to thrive. Mr. Goodman has credited his success and tenacity during his time at Gary Job Corps to the students he has represented.

In his free time, Mr. Goodman has also served in many nonprofit organizations and committees in San Marcos, Texas. However, his believes his greatest success is marrying his childhood sweetheart. Mr. Goodman and his wife, Eva, will be celebrating their 49th wedding anniversary this December.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIMMY GOMEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, during Roll Call Vote number 355 on H.R. 2740, I mistakenly recorded my vote as No when I should have voted Aye.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE OF CONSUELLO ''CONNIE'' HARPER

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize the life of Mrs. Consuello ''Connie'' Harper.

Mrs. Harper, former president and CEO of Central Alabama Opportunities Industrialization Center, passed away on June 17, 2019.

The program has helped train and equip low-to-moderate income families in Central Alabama since 1968. Mrs. Harper's nationally recognized self-help programs included providing women with non-traditional training in highway construction and young adults with Job Readiness Training.

Mrs. Harper's daughter, Sylvia Harper, and grandson, Retired Army Special Forces ''Green Beret'' Lieutenant Colonel Kali McMurray, will continue OIC's work.

Mrs. Harper also worked as an educator in Macon County and served on the Macon County School Board. Her husband, Socrates Harper, is a retired educator and previously served as District County Commissioner for Macon County.

She was a lifelong resident of the Tysonville community in Macon County.

Madam Speaker, please join me in commemorating the life of Mrs. Harper.

CONGRATULATING ST. ELIZABETH'S BASEBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2019 CLASS I STATE BASEBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating my hometown high school, the St. Elizabeth Hornets Baseball team for winning the 2019 Missouri Class I State Baseball Championship.

This team and Coach, Caleb Heckemeyer, should be commended for their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community. This is the first year since 1997 the Hornets have won the title, with many more good seasons to come.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the St. Elizabeth Hornets Baseball team for a job well done.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND MILITARY SERVICE OF WORLD WAR II VETERAN, JAMES E. HUDSON

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and military service of World War II Veteran James E. Hudson. Mr. Hudson has always placed God and family first in his life, offering friendship and brotherly love to all those who crossed his path.

Mr. Hudson was born on June 21, 1919, in Tishomingo County, Mississippi. He spent his childhood in Iuka, MS with his parents, Milton and Florence Hudson, and his seven siblings. Mr. Hudson graduated from Iuka High School where he played on the basketball team.

Mr. Hudson was drafted to the United States Army right out of high school in 1941. He spent his basic training at Camp LeJeune, North Carolina before being sent to Fort Bliss, Texas, to serve in the First Calvary division, also known as the Horse Calvary, of the United States Army. Mr. Hudson was later deployed to the Pacific theater where he went to New Guinea, the Bismarck Archipelago, the Southern Philippines, and Luzon for 2 years. He completed his service in 1945.

After the War, Mr. Hudson returned to Iuka, Mississippi where he still resides to this day. He married his sweetheart, Mae Romine from Florence, Alabama and they had four children. Mr. Hudson worked as a carpenter for TVA building dams on the Tennessee River. He has been blessed with thirteen grandchildren and sixteen great-grandchildren.

Throughout his life and to this day, Mr. Hudson set an example for his children to follow. Mr. Hudson, a lifelong Christian, is a Methodist and attributes his 100 years of happiness to Psalm 118:24: ''This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad therein.''

On June 21st of 2019, Mr. Hudson will celebrate his 100th birthday. Mr. Hudson is an American patriot who served our great nation and continues to set an example for others to follow. We wish him many more years of good health.

NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, I rise to commemorate National Gun Violence Awareness Month. Since 2017, National Gun Violence Awareness month has been celebrated annually in June.

For too long and too often we, as a nation, have mourned with yet another community that was tragically impacted by gun violence. This is one community too many. Deaths from mass shootings in the U.S. are increasing at an alarming rate. After Sandy Hook, over 2,086 mass shootings have taken lives of Americans. From the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh to the gurdwara in Oak Creek; from Sandy Hook Elementary to Stoneman Douglas High School; from the Pulse Night Club in Florida to the music festival shooting in Las Vegas—these places and events have sadly become memorialized. And there are countless more victims of gun violence who never made it to our news cycle.

Gun violence is indeed an epidemic. In addition to the lives lost, every bullet—every gunshot—rips apart the fabric of a community. For all those who were faced with gun violence—there is no going back. One such tragedy is one too many.

Victims of domestic abuse are especially susceptible to gun violence. That is why we must do all that we can to protect survivors of dating violence and stalking. Currently, nearly one million women alive today have been shot or shot at by an intimate partner. Studies have also shown that women experiencing situations where domestic abusers have access to a gun are five times as likely to be fatally shot. Women of color suffer from an even higher risk of death in similar situations.

We cannot become desensitized to the number of deaths in the news. We must act now. That is why I was proud to help pass on the floor of the House of Representatives H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, and H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act to ensure universal background checks and close the Charleston loophole that enabled the hate crime at Mother Emanuel Church. In the 100 days of Senate's inaction and refusal to allow these bills a vote on the Senate floor, 233 New Yorkers were killed by gun violence. This—and every incident of gun violence—is a travesty.

No one should live their lives in constant fear. No parent should have to fear for their children as their kids go to school. No one should fear if their presence in a place of worship or a theatre makes them vulnerable.

Madam Speaker, as we mark National Gun Violence Awareness Month, we must be even more emboldened to demand change now. We need to remind the nation—including our policymakers—of the lives that have been taken by gun violence and the urgent need for commonsense gun violence prevention. I call on my colleagues in the Senate to pass H.R. 8 today. While National Gun Violence Awareness Month occurs in June, we must fight every single day of the year to prevent the countless deaths caused by the lack of gun restrictions. Thoughts and prayers are meaningless without critical action. Enough is enough.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, on the evening of Tuesday, June 18th, I was leading a night tour for a group of students visiting from Arkansas and was not aware that the vote times had been moved up by one hour and therefore missed the first five votes in the series. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 334, Yea on Roll Call No. 335, Yea on Roll Call No. 336, Yea on Roll Call No. 337, and Yea on Roll Call No. 338.

RECOGNIZING LEOR TORCHMAN AUERBACH FOR RECEIVING THE SCOOP JACKSON AWARD

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, in partnership with my colleague, Congressman ADAM KINZINGER, I rise to recognize Leor Torchman Auerbach for being honored with the 2019 CityPAC Scoop Jackson Award. Her career and service for over 20 years as an advocate and leader in Chicago's Pro-Israel advocacy community make her an ideal recipient for this honor. She has devoted her personal time and professional career to strengthening the U.S.-Israel relationship.

Since the 2000's, Leor has served as a longtime CityPAC Board member and her organizational and fund-raising approach set the standard that CityPAC continues to emulate. She has also served as the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) Chicago Co-Chair of the Young Leadership Council in addition to her continuing role as an AIPAC Illinois Council Member.

She leads Americans United in Support of Democracy, a political action committee which has organized more than one thousand community events for Members of Congress, cultivating bipartisan support for the U.S.-Israel relationship.

Leor's deep passion for Israel is reflected in her work. As a granddaughter of Holocaust survivors, she is a friend and supporter to the entire community, and her activism is an inspiration and model for us all.

Madam Speaker, we ask our colleagues to join us in recognizing Leor Torchman Auerbach for her receipt of the 2019 CityPAC Scoop Jackson Award. She is an inspiring figure in our community and we thank her for her years of service.

IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH, WORLD REFUGEE DAY, AND H.R. 2489, THE WAIVER ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration, of Immigrant Heritage Month and World Refugee Day, which comes at a time when this Administration is undertaking unprecedented and cruel actions against immigrants.

Each June, we recognize the enormous contributions that immigrants have made to our country. Our country is a nation of immigrants and during this month we acknowledge their work in our military, as entrepreneurs, as educators, and activists.

Today is also World Refugee Day.

This year, the United States will only accept up to 30,000 refugees—a historically low number. In 2016, our country took in almost 85,000 refugees. We must do better.

As Americans of conscience, we must commit ourselves to standing against any treatment of immigrants and refugees that contradicts our values of inclusion and support for human rights.

This Administration has undertaken a shameful immigration blueprint that has attacked and demonized immigrants at every turn. From the discriminatory Muslim Ban to the cruel Family Separation Policy, these actions will forever be a stain on our nation's history.

The immigration policies of this President will also leave lasting scars for countless individuals and families. These include:

Children ripped away from their parents and loved ones;

Veterans deported after bravely serving our country;

Children in government custody who had legal services, classes and recreation canceled;

DREAMers who have had their DACA protections stripped away; and

Immigrants at detention facilities with abhorrent conditions, including private prisons being run by for-profit contractors.

We are better than this.

I am working to improve conditions at immigration detention facilities. Immigrants in U.S. custody should be treated with dignity and respect. That is why I recently introduced the Waiver Accountability and Transparency Act, H.R. 2489.

My legislation will stop U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's abuse of a waiver system that allows detention facilities to circumvent critical federal standards. Waiving these standards endangers the health and safety of tens of thousands of immigrants.

In January, the Department of Homeland Security's Office of the Inspector General released a report showing that ICE had no formal policies to manage the waiver process and it detailed egregious waivers granted by ICE.

For example, ICE signed off on a waiver to allow the for-profit contractor CoreCivic to use CS gas, a chemical agent 10 times more toxic than pepper spray, at the Otay Mesa Detention Center in California.

Furthermore, the Otero County Processing Center in New Mexico was given a waiver by ICE allowing them to commingle low-custody and high-custody detainees. Detention standards prohibit commingling detainees with serious criminal histories with those who are nonviolent or have only committed immigration-related infractions.

My bill reforms ICE's out-of-control waiver process through increased transparency, accountability, and oversight. ICE would need to notify Congress and post online whenever a waiver is granted. ICE's leadership would need to sign off on waivers. Waivers would no longer be granted for indefinite amounts of time and would need to be renewed every 90 days. In the most serious cases, a corrective action plan must be in place before a waiver could be granted.

We must do better. Those seeking a better life are not criminals and must be treated with dignity and respect.

As we recognize Immigrant Heritage Month and World Refugee Day, it is vital to not only reflect on and celebrate the contributions of immigrants to our country, but to also act against this Administration's anti-immigrant policies.

IN HONOR OF A&W RESTAURANTS

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the oldest franchise restaurant in America—A&W. Today is its 100th birthday. As the automobile opened new horizons for Americans, A&W Restaurants pioneered the drive-in restaurant and made the Root Beer Float a household treat.

These small businesses are a source of fond memories for generations of Americans. A&W's beloved mascot Rooty the Great Root Bear is known from coast to coast.

A&W opened doors of opportunity so people could start their own businesses as franchise owners. These iconic restaurants became hubs in towns across America, and A&W developed a culture of giving back, reflecting the very best of heartland values.

Today begins their annual fundraising drive for Disabled American Veterans. A&W has raised over $800,000 for veteran-related charities since 2011.

A&W is owned by its franchise partners, who independently operate nearly 600 U.S. restaurants. The National A&W Franchisee Association headquarters is located in Richmond, Kentucky.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in welcoming the A&W family to Washington to celebrate their 100th Anniversary.

RECOGNIZING ALICE RODRIGUEZ

HON. BILL FLORES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. FLORES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alice Rodriguez of Waco, Texas, who recently retired from the Waco City Council.

Alice was first elected to the Waco City Council in 1991. At the time of her election, she was the first Hispanic woman on the city council. She served for 10 years before taking a break from 2001 to 2005. In 2005, she ran again and served for another 14 years. Her combined years of service make her the longest serving councilmember in Waco's history.

Alice was first encouraged to run for office to make a change in her community. Inspired by her father, and recalling the difficulties faced by the Hispanic community, she wanted to advocate for equality for minorities and Wacoans facing hardship.

During her career on the city council, Alice was a passionate voice for her constituents. While she supported forward looking policies to conserve neighborhoods and bring more opportunities for low-income families, Alice also wanted to preserve the past.

Alice was instrumental in the foundation of the Waco Hispanic Museum that opened in 2016. Alice wanted current and future generations to remember the strides made by the Hispanic community in Waco and appreciate their struggle for equality.

In addition to serving on the Waco City Council, Alice has served on the boards of several organization including National League

of Cities' University Communities Council, the Texas Municipal League Association of Hispanic Municipal Officials, and the Heart of Texas Council of Governments Executive Committee. She has also been a member of the League of United Latin American Citizens and will continue to serve as local Council 273's Executive Director.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Alice Rodriguez for her many years of influential service to our Central Texas community. I wish her the best in her future endeavors.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to recognize the community service and accomplishments of Alice Rodriguez.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country, for our veterans, for our military men and women who protect us, and for our first responders who keep us safe at home.

IN RECOGNITION OF ELIZABETH ''BETSY'' BARRETT

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Elizabeth ''Betsy'' Barrett as she is honored by the Sandy Hook Foundation for her years of service. It is my pleasure to join with the Sandy Hook Foundation in thanking Ms. Barrett for her tenure as President and her continued service on the Board of Trustees. Ms. Barrett's exemplary leadership and contributions to the Sandy Hook Foundation and the greater Monmouth County area are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

Throughout her many years with the Sandy Hook Foundation, Ms. Barrett has been a tireless advocate for the park and its historical and ecological importance. Under her leadership, the Sandy Hook Foundation has assisted the National Park Service in preserving valuable landmarks and highlighting the area's recreational offerings to attract thousands of visitors to the park. At her direction, the Foundation provided resources for the renovations of the deteriorating Sandy Hook Lighthouse Keepers Quarters and Superstorm Sandy-damaged History House along Fort Hancock's Officer's Row. Additionally, following Superstorm Sandy's destruction on Sandy Hook, Ms. Barrett mobilized the Foundation to assist park staff and emergency personnel as they tackled the needs associated with reopening the park, helping navigate logistical challenges and bringing food to the site.

From her hands-on help after Superstorm Sandy to her friendly assistance to visitors needing directions, Ms. Barrett is deeply involved with the success and vitality of Sandy Hook. Her leadership and hard work have greatly benefited the park and its visitors. Her efforts as President of the Sandy Hook Foundation are valuable to our community and help ensure that this historical and natural site is available for future generations to enjoy.

Madam Speaker, once again, please join me in thanking Betsy Barrett for her years as President of the Sandy Hook Foundation and her continued support and involvement.

IN HONOR OF DORIS IRENE PROULX

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Doris Irene Proulx, who is being honored as the Franco-American of the year by the Franco-American Centre of New Hampshire. The Franco-American Centre of New Hampshire is a non-profit working to preserve the rich heritage of French communities in New Hampshire by promoting history, culture, and education of their historic, cultural, and artistic contributions. A proud member of the Franco-American community, Doris has served our state with unbridled distinction, as a school guidance counselor, through constant community service, and active involvement in her faith community.

Doris Irene Proulx was born and raised in Manchester, growing up in a bilingual French/English household. She served the community in a professional capacity for 38 years as a guidance counselor at Manchester High School West, including 21 years as Director of Guidance. During this time, she earned the NH Excellence in Education Award for Guidance and was named Counselor of the Year.

Throughout her life, she has been a committed public servant, serving as a former president of both the Manchester Women's Club and the Richelieu Club of Manchester. She is also a Goodwill Ambassador and is an active Member of the Franco-American Centre.

Doris continued to serve her faith community as a former president of the Missionary Rosebushes, Cardinal Lacroix Academy Advisory Board, Lady of the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulcher of Jerusalem, and currently serves as a section representative for the Diocese of Manchester. Additionally, she has been a lector in both English and French at St. Ann-St. Augustin and St. Anthony Churches for over 18 years.

On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire's First Congressional District, I want to thank Doris for her decades of dedication to our community. I congratulate her again on this well-deserved honor, and I thank her for all that she does to make our state such a wonderful place to learn, live, and grow.

CALLING ON VIETNAM TO RELEASE MICHAEL NGUYEN

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to join my colleagues, especially KATIE PORTER who has shown exceptional leadership on this important issue, in calling on Vietnam to release Michael Nguyen and allow him to return home to his family.

Born in Vietnam, Michael left the country in 1975 and is a U.S. citizen who lives in my home state of California. Michael has lived in the United States for decades and has no criminal record. In fact, he has been an exemplary citizen. Besides being a business owner and committed family man, Michael is active in his church and his community.

In July 2018, Michael traveled to Vietnam to visit elderly family members. He had regularly gone on trips to Vietnam. This time, however, Michael was detained and imprisoned by the Vietnamese police. It was over a week before Vietnam even acknowledged Michael had been detained. Then, for nearly a year, his family, the American consulate, and concerned members of Congress were given no information about his alleged wrongdoings. Instead, despite repeated inquiries into the nature of his alleged crimes, the Vietnamese authorities kept stating that he was under investigation. It is a red flag that Michael was imprisoned for months and months without being formally charged with a crime. Making matters worse, he was not allowed to speak or see his family members, nor was he given access to an attorney.

Only recently was Michael officially indicted on the vague charge of carrying out activities against the Vietnamese government. Although Michael's trial is expected to begin later this month, his alleged transgressions are apparently still a state secret in Vietnam.

As Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia, I hope to strengthen the U.S.-Vietnamese relationship. Our two countries have many common interests. Despite the scars of history, we have a burgeoning friendship. Many U.S. companies have large operations in Vietnam—including Nike, Adidas, Under Armour, Levi's, and Converse—helping to propel Vietnam's extraordinary economic growth.

Michael's unjust imprisonment jeopardizes this progress. To avoid that outcome, the Vietnamese government should immediately release Michael and allow him to return home to his family in California. That would be a win-win outcome for the United States and Vietnam. Most importantly, it would bring an end to the unimaginable tragedy Michael's loving wife and children have had to endure over the last year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Madam Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on June 18, 2019 for Roll Call Vote 323, Roll Call Vote 324, Roll Call Vote 325, Roll Call 326, Roll Call 327, Roll Call 328, Roll Call 329, Roll Call 330, Roll Call 331, and Roll Call 332. Had I been present, my vote would have been the following: Aye on Roll Call Vote 323, No on Roll Call Vote 324, Aye on Roll Call Vote 325, Aye on Roll Call Vote 326, No on Roll Call Vote 327, Aye on Roll Call Vote 328, No on Roll Call Vote 329, Aye on Roll Call Vote 330, Aye on Roll Call Vote 331, and Aye on Roll Call 332.

CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF MANISTEE

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it's my honor to recognize the city of Manistee upon the occasion of its 150th Anniversary. Through one and a half centuries of community investment and growth, Manistee has become an indispensable part of Northern Michigan.

The first Europeans to settle in what was eventually called Manistee were Jesuit missionaries in the 18th century. By the mid-1800s, the settlement had grown into a successful hub for the fur and lumber trades in the region. While the town was nearly destroyed by the Great Michigan Fire in 1871, the city of Manistee would recover and evolve over the following century and a half into the jewel of Northern Michigan that it is today.

In honor of Manistee's sesquicentennial, the Manistee County Historical Museum is hosting a variety of events and celebrations throughout the year. The festivities kicked off in February with the "Fun with the Founding Fathers" event, where visitors learned about the incorporation of the city of Manistee, the first city council, and the people that made Manistee what it is today. The closing ceremonies for the year-long festivities will be in December, with the "Wintertime in the City" exhibit of photographs showing the winter season in Manistee over the last 150 years.

Madam Speaker, day after day, the city of Manistee continues to set a positive example of what can be achieved when the people of a community work together for the common good. It's my honor to congratulate them for their 150 years of success and community growth. On behalf of my constituents, I wish Manistee all the best as it ventures into the future.

CONGRATULATING THE PROSPER HIGH SCHOOL MEN'S LACROSSE TEAM

HON. VAN TAYLOR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate the Prosper High School Men's Lacrosse team on bringing home their first state championship title by defeating the Smithson Valley Rangers 11 to 5.

This team proved their ability to stay composed while overcoming obstacles under pressure. Winning is not just about talent, skill, or the type of cleats you wear; winning is about character on and off the fleld alongside hard work and commitment to one's team.

The Prosper Eagles showed their dedication to these values from the very beginning.

I know I speak on behalf of our entire community when I say, the city of Prosper is beaming with pride.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Prosper High School Men's Lacrosse team on their successful season.

2019 PROSPER MEN'S LACROSSE TEAM

Parker Haven
Mikey Nader
Jack Delano
Zane Williams
Luke Teigen
Garrett Elliott
Lee Rowden
Sam Osborne
Tucker Faircloth
Nolan DaRosa
Cabe Parham
Christian Acosta
Connor Hill
Cole Garvin
Broc Tullis
Carson Fearin
Zach Eckstein
Brandon Pierce
Cole Schmitt
Landon Silerio
Bryce Murrin
Tyler Trampas
Michael Vandershuit
Justin Endicott
Aeden Fenley
Ryan Myers
Hunter Sheffield
Peyton Marshall
Hayden Stout
Will Honeycutt
Nathan Typrin
Cole Spurr
Coach Corey Caputo

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK TAKANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 2019

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes:

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I rise in support of En Bloc Amendment No. 2, which includes my language that makes clear the intent of Congress to maintain federal protections under the Civil Rights Act.

Since 1964, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act has prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in all federally funded programs and activities. It is the law of the land. Unfortunately, there have been widespread efforts by this Administration to roll back protections under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Rollback of any parts of the Civil Rights Act, including Title VI, would have a devastating impact on countless people.

It is the intent of Congress to instruct that all federal agencies vigorously enforce and implement the civil rights protections guaranteed under Title VI and Congress will be opposed to any and all efforts to undermine these protections whether intentional or not.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JERRY McNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I erroneously voted "no" on Amendment 24 offered by Representatives Amash and Lofgren to H.R. 2740. I would like to correct my vote to a "yes" on this amendment.

RECOGNIZING INTERFAITH TAMPA BAY ON THEIR FIFTH ANNUAL INTERFAITH PRIDE WORSHIP SERVICE

HON. CHARLIE CRIST

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. CRIST. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Interfaith Tampa Bay on their fifth annual Interfaith Pride Worship Service in St. Petersburg, Florida. I am honored to represent such an inclusive and diverse district. This worship service demonstrates that an attitude of not just tolerance, but acceptance, is shared by our faith leaders of all beliefs and backgrounds.

Interfaith Tampa Bay is an organization uniting faith leaders and believers of different religious backgrounds, coming together in prayer, service, and mutual support. The Pride Worship Service, taking place within the city-wide celebration of St. Pete Pride, gives LGBTQ members of the faith community an opportunity to worship and celebrate God's love surrounded by those who accept and support them. The Pride Worship Service invites all in attendance to worship at the altar of compassion, kindness, and understanding.

Hosted by King of Peace Metropolitan Community Church in St. Petersburg, Florida, the Pride Worship Service features leaders of the Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and Buddhist faiths. This service is proceeded by a Pride March through the streets of the city to the steps of the church, demonstrating the interconnectivity between faith, pride, and self-love. It is a message to all that one need not choose between their faith and their identity, and that it is only when we are able to truly love ourselves that we are able to love God.

Through the Pride Worship Service and other community gatherings, Interfaith Tampa Bay is fostering a sense of community between the faith communities in our region, and reestablishing the church, mosque, synagogue, and other houses of worship as places of love and enlightenment for all. Recently, the organization hosted the Tampa Bay Iftar Dinner to celebrate the Muslim observance of Ramadan and recognize the achievements of Tampa Bay's Muslim community. In light of recent incidences of violence within these sacred spaces, the role of Interfaith Tampa Bay and similar institutions is incredibly important in the fight against intolerance and hate.

On behalf of my Tampa Bay neighbors, I want to recognize Interfaith Tampa Bay, King of Peace MCC, Allendale UMC, Congregation B'Nai Israel, and all participating faith organizations for their support of the LGBTQ community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2019

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I rise today to correct the official record regarding two of my recorded votes from yesterday's House consideration of H.R. 2740, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2020.

During the chamber's recorded vote on House Amendment 379 I voted aye rather no, which was not my intention. Further, although I was not able to cast a vote-for House Amendment 381, I wish to note that I would have voted aye.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 2019

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes:

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, my amendment would place a funding limitation on the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to utilize the Title 42 hiring authority.

The Title 42 hiring authority gives the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) the ability to incentivize and expedite the recruitment of scientists and other experts working in the cutting edge of public health. Congress authorized this authority for HHS alone in the 1940s. However, in 2006, this authority was extended to the Environmental Protection Agency by an appropriations bill—it did not go through the authorization process.

A 2015 report by the EPA's Office of Inspector General discovered that the EPA did not properly demonstrate a need to use the Title 42 hiring authority, nor did it provide clear and convincing justification for its continued use. As of 2015, the total annual salary for EPA Title 42 appointments is between $3.5 million and $6.75 million. This is just further evidence that the EPA's use of the Title 42 hiring authority must come to an end. The ability of the EPA to hire outside of the regular General Services scale must first go through regular order.

I urge support for this amendment so that Congress has the time to fully review this problematic hiring authority before appropriating additional funding.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4131–S4196

Measures Introduced: Twenty-seven bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1915–1941, S. Res. 254–258, and S. Con. Res. 20. **Pages S4168–69**

Measures Passed:

Resolutions of Disapproval of Proposed Transfers of Certain Defense Articles and Services:

By 53 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 177), Senate passed S.J. Res. 36, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services. **Page S4142**

By 53 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 178), Senate passed S.J. Res. 38, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services. **Page S4142**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 27, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom and Australia certain defense articles and services. **Pages S4142–45**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 28, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services. **Pages S4142–45**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 29, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services. **Pages S4142–45**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 30, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services. **Pages S4142–45**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 31, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services. **Pages S4142–45**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 32, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services. **Pages S4142–45**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 33, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services. **Pages S4142–45**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 34, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services. **Pages S4142–45**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 35, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services. **Pages S4142–45**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 37, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services. **Pages S4142–45**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 39, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services. **Pages S4142–45**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 40, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services. **Pages S4142–45**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 41, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Government of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates and

the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of technical data and defense services.

Pages S4142–45

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 42, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services.

Pages S4142–45

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 43, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

Pages S4142–45

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 44, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed retransfer of certain defense articles from the United Arab Emirates to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. **Pages S4142–45**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 45, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

Pages S4142–45

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 46, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services.

Pages S4142–45

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 47, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

Pages S4142–45

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 179), Senate passed S.J. Res. 48, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services.

Pages S4142–45

American Eagle Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 257, designating June 20, 2019, as "American Eagle Day" and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States. **Page S4195**

National Brain Tumor Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 258, expressing support for the designation of May 2019 as "National Brain Tumor Awareness Month". **Page S4195**

World Elder Abuse Awareness Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 242, designating June 15, 2019, as "World Elder Abuse Awareness Day", and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S4195**

Northern Mariana Islands Long-Term Legal Residents Relief Act: Senate passed H.R. 559, to amend section 6 of the Joint Resolution entitled "A Joint Resolution to approve the Covenant To Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, and for other purposes". **Page S4195**

Measures Considered:

National Defense Authorization Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, post-cloture.

Pages S4145–51, S4151–62

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, the post-cloture time on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill expire at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, June 24, 2019. **Page S4151**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m. on Monday, June 24, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, post-cloture, under the previous order. **Pages S4195–96**

Vote Correction—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senator Whitehouse be permitted to change his vote from nay to yea on Vote No. 176 since it will not affect the outcome. **Page S4150**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 86 yeas to 5 nays (Vote No. EX. 180), Rita Baranwal, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Nuclear Energy). **Page S4151**

Seth Daniel Appleton, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Dino Falaschetti, of Montana, to be Director, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, for a term of six years.

Robert Hunter Kurtz, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Bimal Patel, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Allison Herren Lee, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2022.

Keith Krach, of California, to be an Under Secretary of State (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment).

Keith Krach, of California, to be United States Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Keith Krach, of California, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of five years; United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years.

Jeffrey L. Eberhardt, of Wisconsin, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador.

Page S4151

Executive Communications: **Pages S4166–67**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S4167–68**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S4168**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4169–72**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4172–76**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4165–66**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4179–94**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S4194–95**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S4195**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—180) **Pages S4142–43, S4151**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 4:57 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 24, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S4195–96.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

COLLECTION OF BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP INFORMATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine outside perspectives on the collection of beneficial ownership information, after receiving testimony from Greg Baer, Bank Policy Institute, Karen Harned, National Federation of Independent Business Small Business Legal Center, and Gary Kalman, Financial Accountability and Corporate Transparency Coalition, all of Washington, D.C.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION OVERSIGHT

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Manufacturing, Trade, and Consumer Protection concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Consumer Product Safety Commission, after receiving testimony from Ann Marie Buerkle, Acting Chairman, and Robert S. Adler, Dana Baiocco, Peter A. Feldman, and Elliot F. Kaye, each a Commissioner, all of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Robert Wallace, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

ADVANCED GEOTHERMAL ENERGY

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine opportunities and challenges for advanced geothermal energy development in the United States, after receiving testimony from Daniel R. Simmons, Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, and Katherine R. Young, Geothermal Program Manager, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, both of the Department of Energy; Tim Spisak, State Director for New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas and Kansas, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Tim Latimer, Fervo Energy, San Francisco, California; and Paul A. Thomsen, ORMAT Technologies, Reno, Nevada, on behalf of the Geothermal Resource Council.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Andrew P. Bremberg, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador, Philip S. Goldberg, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Colombia, Doug Manchester, of California, to be Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas, Adrian Zuckerman, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to Romania, Richard B. Norland, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to Libya, Jonathan R. Cohen, of California, to be Ambassador to the Arab Republic of Egypt, and John Rakolta, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Mary S. McElroy, to be United States District Judge for the District of Rhode Island, Gary Richard Brown, Diane Gujarati, Eric

Ross Komitee, and Rachel P. Kovner, each to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, Stephanie Dawkins Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, Stephanie A. Gallagher, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, Lewis J. Liman, and Mary Kay Vyskocil, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Martha Maria Pacold, Mary M. Rowland, and Steven C. Seeger, each to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Jason K. Pulliam, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, John L. Sinatra, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, Frank William Volk, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of West Virginia, David Austin Tapp, of Kentucky, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, and Edward W. Felten, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 25 public bills, H.R. 3373–3397; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 68; and H. Res. 452–455 were introduced. **Pages H5005–06**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5007–08**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 1815, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission, when developing rules and regulations about disclosures to retail investors, to conduct investor testing, including a survey and interviews of retail investors, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–123). **Page H5005**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Watson Coleman to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4921**

Recess: The House recessed at 9:50 a.m. and reconvened at 10 a.m. **Page H4926**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Very Rev. Canon Martini Shaw, Historic African Episcopal Church of St. Thomas, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. **Pages H4926–27**

Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020: The House considered of H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, June 21st. **Pages H4929–78, H4978–97**

Agreed to:

Crow amendment (No. 65 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that ensures that the U.S. Census Bureau follow existing law and not share data or information gathered, especially through data sharing agreements, with any department, bureau, or agency and penalizes disclosure of information by Census employees; **Pages H4930–31**

Dean amendment (No. 66 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases funding for the John R. Justice Program by $2,000,000, to provide student loan repayment assistance for public defenders and prosecutors; this program is intended to serve as an incentive for qualified individuals to enter and continue employment as public defenders or prosecutors—without this vital funding, the program will continue to fall short of its mission; **Page H4931**

Escobar amendment (No. 68 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that prohibits funds from being used to enforce the zero-tolerance prosecution policy at the Department of Justice; **Pages H4931–32**

Horn amendment (No. 71 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that decreases and increases funding by $2.5 million for Byrne Justice Assistance Grants Memorial funding dedicated to training to improve police responses to people with developmental disabilities or mental illnesses; **Pages H4933–34**

Golden amendment (No. 72 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases funding for the veterans treatment courts program by $1,000,000; **Page H4934**

Malinowski amendment (No. 73 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases funding for the National Security Division by $1,000,000 to be directed towards the Domestic Terrorism Counsel; **Pages H4934–35**

Neguse amendment (No. 75 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases funding by $1

million for the NASA Office of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Engagement, for the purposes of supporting the NASA Space Grant College and Fellowship Program; **Page H4935**

Neguse amendment (No. 76 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases and decreases funding for the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) by $5 million in order to encourage states to continue to improve their criminal and mental records for the National Instant Criminal Background Check System; **Pages H4935–36**

Ocasio-Cortez amendment (No. 78 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that moves $5 million from the DEA (enforcement) to the Comprehensive Opioid Abuse Program (treatment) in keeping with the growing consensus to treat drug addiction as a public health issue; **Page H4936**

Omar amendment (No. 79 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases and decreases funding for the Federal Prison System by $1 million to express concern with the use of solitary confinement within the Federal Bureau of Prisons or the United States Marshals Service; **Pages H4936–37**

Porter amendment (No. 81 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases funding for the court-appointed special advocate and guardian ad litem program to $12,500,000; **Page H4937**

Porter amendment (No. 82 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases funding to reduce the sexual assault kit backlog to $50,000,000; **Pages H4937–38**

Pressley amendment (No. 83 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that directs an additional $3,000,000 to DOJ's Children of Incarcerated Parents program to support reentry services and family reunification upon release; **Page H4938**

Pressley amendment (No. 84 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases and decreases funding by $2,000,000 for Byrne Justice Assistance Grants Memorial funding to support community-based violence prevention programs; **Pages H4938–39**

Bishop (GA) en bloc amendment No. 3 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119: Jackson Lee (No. 91) that increases funding by $2,000,000 for the USDA agency that provides grant research funding for ''1890s Land Grant Universities,'' which are 28 Historically Black Colleges and Universities; Yoho (No. 92) that decreases and increases funds by $5,000,000 to support the research and development of an African Swine Fever vaccine at the Agricultural Research Service; McNerney (No. 93) that increases and decreases by $100,000 for FDA to undertake a process to make lawful a safe level for conventional foods and dietary supplements containing Cannabidiol (CBD) so long as the products are compliant with all other FDA rules and regulations; Rodney Davis (IL) (No. 94) that increases and decreases funds by $5,000,000 for the National Institute of Food and Agriculture's Agriculture and Food Research Initiative; Welch (No. 95) that increases funding for Dairy Business Innovation Initiatives by $10 million; reduces funding for USDA Office of the Chief Information Officer by a corresponding amount; Welch (No. 96) that increases funding for the Acer Access Program by $1 million; reduces funding from USDA Agriculture Marketing Services by a corresponding amount; Sablan (No. 98) that increases and decreases reserve funding in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program by $10,000,000 to allow the Food and Nutrition Service to maintain the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Nutritional Assistance Program at FY19 eligibility and benefit standards; Sewell (AL) (No. 100) that adds and removes funding from the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program Account within USDA's Rural Utilities Service to prioritize the ongoing efforts to address inadequate wastewater infrastructure in rural and unincorporated communities, specifically those where families or individuals have straight-pipe septic systems or failing decentralized sewage treatment systems; Bera (No. 102) that increases and decreases the Child Nutrition Programs account by $2,000,000 to support funding for School Breakfast Expansion Grants that help increase participation through programs such as Breakfast after the Bell; González-Colón (No. 103) that provides $1.996 million to carry out the Reimbursement Transportation Cost Payment Program (RTCP) for Geographically Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers, which reimburses producers in the non-contiguous states and territories for a portion of the cost to transport agricultural commodities or inputs used to produce an agricultural commodity that is offset by a corresponding reduction in the Office of Communications; Sean Patrick Maloney (NY) (No. 104) that decreases funding for the National Institute of Food and Agriculture by $5 million and increases the funding for the National Institute of Food and Agriculture to increase funding for the Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education program; Veasey (No. 106) that increases and decreases funding by $12,000,000 for Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) distributed to states for the purposes of combating Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD); Steil (No. 107) that increases and decreased by $1,500,000 to express the Congressional intent that the Dairy Business Innovation Initiatives should be funded at that level; Plaskett (No. 108) that provides for funding of the micro-grants for food security program at the authorized level of $10 million; Plaskett (No. 109) that provides for inclusion of the insular territories

of the United States within the meaning of the term ''persistent poverty counties''; Joyce (No. 110) that increases and decreases account by $15,000,000 to support a study on preventing the spread of Chronic Wasting Disease; Lamb (No. 111) that provides an additional $200,000 for school nutrition programs and directs those resources to Technical Assistance for the Farm-to-School program; Panetta (No. 112) that adds and removes $1 from the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics for the purpose of instructing the REE Office to finalize a review, as required by the FY19 Farm Bill (Public Law 115–334), of the programs of the Department of Agriculture that may be more effectively used to accelerate the development and use of automation or mechanization in the production or processing of specialty crops; Cox (No. 113) that strikes ''1980, 1990'', and insert ''1990'' to expand the time range for 102030 funding, a formula to fight persistent poverty; Neguse (No. 116) that transfers $1 million in funding to the USDA Office of the Inspector General for expenses necessary for the enforcement of anti-animal fighting statutes; Craig (No. 117) that increases by $353,000 the Rural Energy for American Program to spur rural renewable energy investment; Craig (No. 118) that strikes and adds $1,000,000 to express the importance of broadband access to rural communities, schools, and small businesses; Trone (No. 119) that increases funding for Community Connect Grants by $5 million to expand broadband deployment into rural communities that are underserved by private sector investment; Trone (No. 120) that increases funding for Rural Health and Safety Education Program by $1 million to combat the opioid epidemic in rural communities; Axne (No. 122) that increases and decreases by $1 funds to support the Economic Research Service submit a report to Congress on the impacts of tariffs on U.S. soybean farmers in light of Russian efforts to expand agricultural exports to China; Lee (NV) (No. 123) that provides an additional $500,000 to Team Nutrition of the Child Nutrition Programs Account to encourage peer to peer learning among school nutrition staff to create healthy school environments; makes a corresponding reduction in the Departmental Administration subaccount of the Office of the Secretary; Pressley (No. 124) that increases by $1,000,000 funding for the Farm-to-School Grant Program; and Slotkin (No. 125) that increases and decreases the Farm and Ranch Stress Assistance Network (FRSAN) program by $10 million to fund this critically important program that provides vital mental health resources for farmers and ranchers; **Pages H4940–43**

Underwood amendment (No. 115 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that prevents funds from being used to remove existing information about climate change from official publications;

Pages H4945–48

McCollum en bloc amendment No. 4 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119: Scanlon (No. 126) that decreases and increases funding by $2 million from the Environmental Programs and Management fund for purposes of EPA enforcement authority over Clean Air Act regulations related to waste-to-energy incinerators; DeGette (No. 138) that removes and adds $3,000,000 from the Environmental Programs and Management fund to instruct EPA to advance environmental justice by implementing environmental enforcement strategies in 100 communities overburdened by serious environmental non-compliance problems and instruct EPA to research the cumulative risks posed by multiple sources of pollution, and to incorporate this information into EPA health assessments; Grijalva (No. 141) that prohibits the Department of the Interior from transferring jurisdictions of National Parks, Wildlife Refuges, and other public lands along the border pursuant to President Trump's declaration of a national emergency to build a wall along the southern border in contravention of Congress; Grijalva (No. 142) that states that none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Executive Order 13817, which treats uranium as a critical mineral for the purposes of expedited permitting under the administration's critical mineral strategy; Luján (NM) (No. 152) that prevents any of the funds made available by this act to be used for further mineral development around the Chaco Culture National Historical Park on federal lands; does not affect the mineral rights of an Indian Tribe or member of an Indian Tribe to trust land or allotment land; Luján (NM) (No. 153) that increases and decreases $1,500,000 for the Rio Puerco Watershed Management Program, as authorized in S. 47, the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act; Bonamici (No. 155) that increases funding for the EPA Science Advisory Board by $500,000, and decreases funding for the EPA Executive Management and Operations program by $500,000 to support the SAB review of the Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science proposed rule; Jeffries (No. 159) that states that none of the funds made available by this Act to the National Park Service may be used to increase the sales of plastic bottles; Jeffries (No. 160) that prohibits funds made available to the National Park Service to be used for the purchase or display of a confederate flag with the exception of specific circumstances where the flags provide historical context; Lowenthal (No. 164) that states that none of the funds made available by this Act may

be used to issue a proposed or final rule to replace the Consolidated Federal Oil & Gas and Federal & Indian Coal Valuation Reform final rule; Vargas (No. 169) that increases and decreases by $10,000,000 in order to direct the Environmental Protection Agency to prioritize projects that will drastically reduce pollution flowing across the U.S.-Mexico border; Beyer (No. 170) that prohibits funds to eliminate the requirement that newly built coal power plants capture carbon dioxide emissions; Beyer (No. 171) that increases and decreases $5,000,000 from the Office of the Secretary account for the purpose of maintaining the Interior Department's body camera pilot program; Dingell (No. 172) that prohibits the use of funds in this bill to close or relocate any EPA office that houses emergency responders or a criminal investigation unit; Schneider (No. 175) that increases and decreases $25,000 in funding for the EPA's Environmental Programs and Management account to support EPA public forums and outreach on ethylene oxide to communities identified in the National Air Toxic Assessment to face dangerous emissions levels of this known carcinogen; Horsford (No. 177) that increases and decreases the National Park Service Construction account by $1,000,000 in order to fund the construction of a Visitor's Center at Tule Springs National Monument in Nevada; McEachin (No. 178) that withholds funds for the Department of the Interior's Executive Resources Board unless it is comprised of fifty percent career Senior Executive Service members; O'Halleran (No. 180) that increases by $1 million and decreases by $1 million funding for CFLRP, to highlight the importance of CFLRP to forest restoration, wildfire risk reduction, and rural economic development; O'Halleran (No. 181) that increases and decreases funding by $1 million in the EPA's Superfund Account to highlight the need to increase EPA staffing to meaningfully address over 500 abandoned uranium mines on and near the Navajo Nation; Casten (IL) (No. 182) that prohibits the United States Geological Survey from using funds to limit the use of climate modeling tools; Stevens (No. 192) that adds and removes $2,000,000 from the Environmental Programs and Management account for the purpose of instructing the Environmental Protection Agency to prioritize funding to develop a national recycling strategy to ensure the long-term economic and environmental viability of local recycling programs; and Tlaib (No. 193) that states that none of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the closure of EPA offices in regions that have designated Sulfur Dioxide (2010) Nonattainment Areas; **Pages H4948–51**

Gosar amendment (No. 140 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases and decreases by $1,720,000 for Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) research in wild and captive populations of cervids; **Page H4963**

Smith (MO) amendment (No. 151 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases and decreases the Environmental Program and Management account by $500,000 in order to direct EPA to produce reports on how much environmental measures have improved preceding enactment of USMCA; **Page H4967**

McCollum en bloc amendment No. 5 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119: Scott (VA) (No. 134) that increases funding for the 400 Years of African-American History Commission in order for them to carry out their mandate; Schweikert (No. 137) that increases funding in the Environmental Programs and Management account by $1 million for Air Quality Management and decreases funding in the Department of Interior Office of the Secretary account by $1 million; Hudson (No. 145) that increases and decreases the Capital Maintenance and Improvement account to highlight the need for improvements to roads within the Uwharrie National Forest; Matsui (No. 146) that increases and decreases the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act program by $5 million; Moore (No. 149) that increases and decreases funding by $5 million to express support for increased funding for the lead reduction projects grant program which helps low-income homeowners replace lead pipes; Moore (No. 150) that increases funding by $1 million for the Indian Health Services Domestic Violence Prevention Program to allow for additional grants and decreases $1 million from the Office of the Secretary Departmental Operations account; LaMalfa (No. 154) that increases and decreases $10,000,000 from the Forest Service Recreation, Heritage and Wilderness account to the Forest Service Forest Products account to increase timber production on federal land; Brownley (CA) (No. 157) that increases funding for the Wildland fire management account by $1 million, with the intent it be spent on the Joint Fire Science program, offset with a reduction of $1 million from the Office of the Secretary of Interior's administrative account; Kuster (NH) (No. 162) that increases and decreases $1 million in the National Forest System account to highlight the National Avalanche Center which provides training and support to prevent snow avalanche casualties; Ruiz (No. 166) that increases and decreases funding by $2 million from the State and Private Forestry account for the purposes of highlighting Volunteer Fire Assistance Grants; Ted Lieu (CA) (No. 173) that increases and decreases $200,000 to support the Wildlife Detector Dog Program in the Office of Law Enforcement at the U.S. Fish and

Wildlife Service; Plaskett (No. 174) that provides for inclusion of the insular territories of the United States within the meaning of the term ''persistent poverty counties''; O'Halleran (No. 179) that increases by $7 million and decreases by $7 million funding for Indian Health Service Facilities, to highlight the importance of completing the Hopi Arsenic Mitigation Project, to provide safe drinking water to the Hopi; Casten (No. 183) that increases and decreases funding for Geographic Programs by $1 for the purposes of maintaining the Great Lakes Advisory Board within the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative; Craig (No. 184) that increases and decreases funding by $1,000,000 for the Clean Water Act Section 319 Non-Point Source Pollution Program that is designed to give local and state governments the flexibility to decrease water pollutants through community-based conservation projects; Haaland (No. 185) that increases and decreases funding by $35,000,000 in the Indian Health Service account to support urban Indian health; Haaland (No. 186) that increases and decreases funding by $176,000,000 in the Operation of Indian Programs account to support tribal courts and law enforcement; Levin (MI) (No. 188) that increases and decreases funding by $10 million to support Sewer Overflow Control Grants and prioritize improvements to the Chapaton Retention Basin, a Macomb County, Michigan combined sewer overflow facility, and other projects that protect the Great Lakes and freshwater sources; McAdams (No. 189) that increases and decreases the Wildland Fire Management account by $1 for the purposes of recognizing the important needs of rural counties to be able to properly rehabilitate and remediate burned areas after severe wildfire burn, to ensure our rural communities are prepared for wildfires; and Sherrill (No. 191) that increases and decreases $8,000,000 funding from the Science and Technology Account with the purpose of instructing the EPA to fund the Children's Environmental Health and Disease Prevention Research Centers (agreed by unanimous consent to withdraw the earlier request for a recorded vote to the end that the Chair put the question de novo);

Pages H4956–59, H4977

Blumenauer amendment (No. 17 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that was debated on June 19th that prohibits the Department of Justice from interfering with state cannabis programs (by a recorded vote of 267 ayes to 165 noes, Roll No. 370);

Page H4980

Stevens amendment (No. 85 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that removes and adds $2,000,000 from the Legal Activities account at the Department of Justice for the purpose of instructing the Environment and Natural Resources Division to allocate more resources to the enforcement of animal cruelty laws (by a recorded vote of 381 ayes to 50 noes, Roll No. 373); **Pages H4939, H4982**

Underwood amendment (No. 89 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that prevents the Department of Justice from using federal funds for litigation that undermines the Affordable Care Act (by a recorded vote of 238 ayes to 194 noes, Roll No. 374);

Pages H4939–40, H4982–83

Pence amendment (No. 105 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases funding for the rural broadband Distance Learning and Telemedicine Grant Program by $25,000,000, offset by an equal decrease in the Department of Agriculture's Buildings and Facilities funding (by a recorded vote of 425 ayes to 6 noes, Roll No. 376);

Pages H4944–45, H4984

Spanberger amendment (No. 114 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases funding for USDA's Rural E-Connectivity (ReCon-nect) program, which makes loans and grants for broadband deployment in rural communities by $55 million; (by a recorded vote of 408 ayes to 22 noes, Roll No. 377); **Pages H4945, H4984–85**

Wasserman Schultz amendment (No. 128 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that prohibits any funds from being expended by the Department of the Interior to conduct oil and gas pre-leasing, leasing, and related activities in outer continental shelf planning areas around Florida (by a recorded vote of 252 ayes to 178 noes, Roll No. 378);

Pages H4951–52, H4985–86

Pallone amendment (No. 132 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that establishes a Department of Interior moratorium on oil and gas drilling and related activities in the Atlantic, including the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, and the South Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas (by a recorded vote of 247 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 379);

Pages H4953–54, H4986

Buchanan amendment (No. 133 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that prevents funds from being used by USFWS to issue permits for the importation of elephant or lion trophies from Zimbabwe, Zambia or Tanzania (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 192 noes, Roll No. 380);

Pages H4954–56, H4986–87

Blumenauer amendment (No. 136 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that prevents any funds in this bill from being used to plan, design, study, or construct, for the purpose of harvesting timber by private entities or individuals, a forest development road in the Tongass National Forest (by a recorded vote of 243 ayes to 188 noes, Roll No. 382);

Pages H4960–62, H4988

Cunningham amendment (No. 167 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that states that none of the funds in this Act can be used by BOEM to issue permits for oil and gas exploration, including for seismic airgun blasting, in the Atlantic (by a recorded vote of 245 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 391); **Pages H4973–74, H4994**

Cunningham amendment (No. 168 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases and decreases funding by $5,000,000 to prioritize the Land and Water Conservation Fund (by a recorded vote of 325 ayes to 107 noes, Roll No. 392); **Pages H4974–75, H4994–95**

Carbajal amendment (No. 176 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that states that none of the funds made available by this Act may be used on offshore oil and gas leasing off the Washington/Oregon, Northern California, Central California, and Southern California Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Planning Areas for FY2020 (by a recorded vote of 238 ayes to 192 noes, Roll No. 393); **Pages H4975–76, H4995–96**

Hill (CA) amendment (No. 187 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that increases DOI and Forest Service accounts for wildfire preparedness, wildfire suppression operations, emergency rehabilitation, and hazardous fuels management by $7 million, offset with a reduction in the increase to the Working Capital Fund (by a recorded vote of 377 ayes to 55 noes, Roll No. 394); and **Pages H4976–77, H4996**

Schrier amendment (No. 190 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that prohibits funds to be used for undermining the EPA Mercury and Air Toxics Standard (MATS) (by a recorded vote of 253 ayes to 177 noes, Roll No. 395). **Pages H4977, H4996–97**

Rejected:

Young amendment (No. 129 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that sought to prohibit the use of funds made available to be used for the EPA's rule on emissions from small remote incinerators in Alaska; **Pages H4952–53**

Rutherford amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that was debated on June 19th that sought to increase the NOAA Operations, Research, and Facilities account by $3.5 million for third party data collection of reef fish in the South Atlantic; offset by decreasing the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), Salaries and Expenses account to FY19 levels (by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 245 noes with one answering ''present'', Roll No. 368); **Pages H4978–79**

King (IA) amendment (No. 9 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that was debated on June 19th that sought to strike lines 14–18 (Section 534, pg. 107), which states that none of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used by the Department of Commerce to incorporate into the 2020 Decennial Census any question that was not included in the 2018 End-to-End Census Test in Providence County, Rhode Island (by a recorded vote of 192 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 369); **Pages H4979–80**

Banks amendment (No. 36 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that was debated on June 19th that sought to reduce amounts made available in Division A, other than amounts made available to the Department of Defense, by 14 percent (by a recorded vote of 135 ayes to 296 noes, Roll No. 371); **Pages H4980–81**

Golden amendment (No. 70 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that sought to state that none of the funds may be used for NOAA to utilize a North Atlantic right whale Risk Reduction Decision Support Tool (by a recorded vote of 84 ayes to 345 noes, Roll No. 372); **Pages H4932–33, H4981–82**

Banks amendment (No. 99 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that sought to reduce spending for each amount in Division B by 14 percent (by a recorded vote of 113 ayes to 318 noes, Roll No. 375); **Pages H4943, H4983–84**

Duncan amendment (No. 135 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that sought to prohibit the use of funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the final Clean Power Plan rules (by a recorded vote of 192 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 381); **Pages H4959–60, H4987–88**

Gosar amendment (No. 139 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that sought to prohibit funds for carrying out EPA's Endangerment Finding (by a recorded vote of 178 ayes to 254 noes, Roll No. 383); **Pages H4962–63, H4988–89**

Duncan amendment (No. 143 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that sought to strike section 118 from the bill that prevents energy leases in ANWR (by a recorded vote of 198 ayes to 233 noes, Roll No. 384); **Pages H4963–65, H4989–90**

Mullin amendment (No. 147 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that sought to prohibit funds from being used to enforce the Obama Administration–s Methane Rule, entitled ''Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources'' (by a recorded vote of 191 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 385); **Pages H4965–66, H4990**

Mullin amendment (No. 148 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that sought to prohibit the use of funds to prepare, propose, or promulgate any regulation or guidance that references or relies on analysis of the cost of social carbon under certain Technical Support Documents published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon (by

a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 243 noes, Roll No. 386); **Pages H4966–67, H4990–91**

Graves (LA) amendment (No. 158 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that sought to strike section 117 of division C which prohibits funds for a new Proposed Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program and Notice of Intent to Prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Plan (by a recorded vote of 193 ayes to 239 noes, Roll No. 387); **Pages H4968–69, H4991–92**

Hice (GA) amendment (No. 161 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that sought to decrease each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) by 23.6 percent to match the President's budget request (by a recorded vote of 128 ayes to 304 noes, Roll No. 388); **Pages H4970–71, H4992**

Banks amendment (No. 163 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that sought to reduce spending for each amount available in Division C by 14 percent (by a recorded vote of 132 ayes to 299 noes, Roll No. 389); and **Pages H4971–72, H4992–93**

Biggs amendment (No. 165 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that sought to state that none of the funds made available by this Act can be used for the Integrated Risk Information System of the Environmental Protection Agency (by a recorded vote of 157 ayes to 275 noes, Roll No. 390). **Pages H4972–73, H4993–94**

Withdrawn:

Biggs amendment (No. 101 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prevented funds from being used to finalize, implement, or enforce the draft guidance issued by the Food and Drug Administration in December of 2017 titled "Drug Products Labeled as Homeopathic: Guidance for FDA Staff and Industry"; and **Pages H4943–44**

Newhouse amendment (No. 156 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–119) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited any funds in the bill from being used to either alter or terminate the Interagency Agreement between the U.S. Departments of Labor and Agriculture that governs the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center (CCC) program, and prohibited any funds in the bill from being used to close any of the 25 CCCs that are currently operating. **Pages H4967–68**

H. Res. 445, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3055) and relating to consideration of the bill (H.R. 2740) was agreed to yesterday, June 19th.

Recess: The House recessed at 4:37 p.m. and reconvened at 4:49 p.m. **Page H4978**

Senate Referrals: S.J. Res. 39 was held at the desk. S.J. Res. 40 was held at the desk. S.J. Res. 41 was held at the desk. S.J. Res. 42 was held at the desk. S.J. Res. 43 was held at the desk. S.J. Res. 44 was held at the desk. S.J. Res. 45 was held at the desk. S.J. Res. 46 was held at the desk. S.J. Res. 47 was held at the desk. S.J. Res. 48 was held at the desk. **Pages H4969–70**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on pages H4969–70.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Twenty-eight recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4978–79, H4979–80, H4980, H4980–81, H4981–82, H4982, H4982–83, H4983–84, H4984, H4984–85, H4985–86, H4986, H4986–87, H4987–88, H4988, H4988–89, H4989–90, H4990, H4990–91, H4991–92, H4992, H4992–93, H4993–94, H4994, H4994–95, H4995–96, H4996, and H4996–97. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

Committee Meetings

HOW FARM POLICY HELPS FARMERS IN ADVERSE CONDITIONS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing entitled "How Farm Policy Helps Farmers in Adverse Conditions". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE POTENTIAL IMPLICATIONS OF ELIMINATING BROAD-BASED CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY FOR SNAP HOUSEHOLDS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Nutrition, Oversight, and Department Operations held a hearing entitled "The Potential Implications of Eliminating Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility for SNAP Households". Testimony was heard from Mandela Barnes, Lieutenant Governor, Wisconsin; John Davis, Executive Director, Mississippi Department of Human Services; and public witnesses.

BREATHLESS AND BETRAYED: WHAT IS MSHA DOING TO PROTECT MINERS FROM THE RESURGENCE OF BLACK LUNG DISEASE?

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled "Breathless and Betrayed: What is MSHA Doing to Protect Miners from the Resurgence of Black Lung Disease?". Testimony was heard from John Howard, M.D., Director, National Institute for Occupational

Safety and Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services; David Zatezalo, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine Safety and Health, Department of Labor; Cindy S. Brown Barnes, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

DRIVING IN REVERSE: THE ADMINISTRATION'S ROLLBACK OF FUEL ECONOMY AND CLEAN CAR STANDARDS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce; and Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change held a joint hearing entitled ''Driving in Reverse: The Administration's Rollback of Fuel Economy and Clean Car Standards''. Testimony was heard from William L. Wehrum, Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency; Heidi King, Deputy Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation; and public witnesses.

STRENGTHENING HEALTH CARE IN THE U.S. TERRITORIES FOR TODAY AND INTO THE FUTURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Strengthening Health Care in the U.S. Territories for Today and Into the Future''. Testimony was heard from Anne Schwartz, Executive Director, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission; Angela Avila, Executive Director, Administración de Seguros de Salud de Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico Health Insurance Administration; Maria Theresa Arcangel, Chief Administrator, Guam Division of Public Welfare; Michal Rhymer-Browne, Assistant Commissioner, Department of Human Services, U.S. Virgin Islands; Helen C. Sablan, Medicaid Director, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands State Medicaid Agency; and a public witness.

DIVERSITY IN THE BOARDROOM; EXAMINING PROPOSALS TO INCREASE THE DIVERSITY OF AMERICA'S BOARDS

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Diversity in the Boardroom; Examining Proposals to Increase the Diversity of America's Boards''. Testimony was heard from Chelsa Gurkin, Acting Director, Education, Workforce and Income Security Team, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

WHAT'S YOUR HOME WORTH? A REVIEW OF THE APPRAISAL INDUSTRY

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development, and Insurance held a hearing entitled ''What's Your Home Worth? A Review of the Appraisal Industry''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3190, the ''BURMA Act of 2019''; H.R. 2327, the ''Burma Political Prisoners Assistance Act''; H.R. 1632, the ''Southeast Asia Strategy Act''; H.R. 3252, the ''Global Respect Act''; H. Res. 259, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives to support the repatriation of religious and ethnic minorities in Iraq to their ancestral homelands; H. Res. 432, condemning the attacks on peaceful protesters and supporting an immediate peaceful transition to a civilian-led democratic government in Sudan; H. Res. 441, condemning the attack on the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in July 1994 and expressing the concern of the United States regarding the continuing, 25-year-long delay in the resolution of this case and encouraging accountability for the attack; H. Res. 444, reaffirming the importance of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of refugees and displaced persons; and H.R. 2229, the ''First Responders Passport Act of 2019''. H.R. 3190, H.R. 3252, and H. Res. 441 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 2327, H.R. 1632, H. Res. 259, H. Res. 432, H. Res 444, and H.R. 2229 were ordered reported, as amended.

EXAMINING THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE'S DEPLOYMENT TO THE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Border Security, Facilitation, and Operations held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Department of Defense's Deployment to the U.S.-Mexico Border''. Testimony was heard from Carla Provost, Chief, U.S. Border Patrol, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Robert Salesses, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense Integration and Defense Support of Civil Authorities, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Department of Defense; and Major General Michael T. McGuire, Adjutant General for Arizona, Director, Arizona Department of Emergency and Military Affairs.

OVERSIGHT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Committee on House Administration: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Congressional Research Service''. Testimony was heard from Mary B. Mazanec, Director, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and a public witness.

LESSONS FROM THE MUELLER REPORT, PART II: BIPARTISAN PERSPECTIVES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Lessons from the Mueller Report, Part II: Bipartisan Perspectives''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OIL AND GAS DEVELOPMENT: RESTORING COMMUNITY INPUT AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN LEASING DECISIONS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''Oil and Gas Development: Restoring Community Input and Public Participation in Leasing Decisions''. Testimony was heard from Mike Nedd, Deputy Director, Operations, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

ENSURING QUALITY HEALTH CARE FOR OUR VETERANS

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled ''Ensuring Quality Health Care for Our Veterans''. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Veterans Affairs officials: Tammy Czarnecki, Assistant Deputy Undersecretary for Health for Administrative Operations, Veterans Health Administration; Michael Heimall, Director, Veteran Affairs Medical Center; and Michael Missal, Inspector General, Office of Inspector General.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2528, the ''STEM Opportunities Act of 2019''; H.R. 36, the ''Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act of 2019''; H.R. 3196, the ''Vera Rubin Survey Telescope Designation Act''; and H.R. 3153, the ''Expanding Findings for Federal Opioid Research and Treatment Act''. H.R. 2528 and H.R. 36 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 3196 and H.R. 3153 were ordered reported, without amendment.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ACCURATE CENSUS DATA TO SMALL BUSINESS FORMATION AND GROWTH

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax, and Capital Access held a hearing entitled ''The Importance of Accurate Census Data to Small Business Formation and Growth''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE STATE OF THE RAIL WORKFORCE

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials held a hearing entitled ''The State of the Rail Workforce''. Testimony was heard from Ronald L. Batory, Administrator, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation; and public witnesses.

ENSURING ACCESS TO DISABILITY BENEFITS FOR VETERANS SURVIVORS OF MILITARY SEXUAL TRAUMA

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a hearing entitled ''Ensuring Access to Disability Benefits for Veterans Survivors of Military Sexual Trauma''. Testimony was heard from Representative Pingree; Willie Clark, Deputy Under Secretary for Field Operations, Veterans Benefits Administration; Beth Murphy, Executive Director, Compensation Service, Veterans Benefits Administration; Margret Bell, National Deputy Director for Military Sexual Trauma, Veterans Health Administration; Steve Bracci, Director, Denver Benefits Inspection, Office of Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a business meeting to assign Representative Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan of Northern Mariana Islands to the Health Subcommittee. The resolution assigning Representative Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan of Northern Mariana Islands to the Health Subcommittee passed.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 2943, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs in English and Spanish; H.R. 2942, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women's Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes; H.R. 2676, the ''VA Survey of Cannabis Use Act''; H.R. 2677, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide training in the use of medical cannabis for all Department of Veterans Affairs primary care providers, and for other purposes; H.R. 712, the ''VA Medicinal Cannabis Research Act of 2019''; H.R. 1647, the ''Veterans Equal Access Act''; H.R. 3083, the ''AIR Acceleration Act''; H.R. 485, the ''VREASA''; legislation on Specially Adaptive Housing; and legislation on Work Study. Testimony was heard from Representatives Correa, Cisneros, David P. Roe of Tennessee, and Bilirakis; Larry Mole, Chief Consultant, Population Health Services, Patient Care Services, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3298, the ''The Child Care Quality and Access Act of 2019''; H.R. 3299, the ''The Promoting Respect for Individuals' Dignity and Equality Act of 2019''; H.R. 3300, the ''The Economic Mobility Act of 2019''; and H.R. 3301, the ''The Taxpayer Certainty and Disaster Tax Relief Act of 2019''. H.R. 3298, H.R. 3299, H.R. 3300, and H.R. 3301 were ordered reported, as amended.

CULTIVATING DIVERSITY AND IMPROVING RETENTION AMONG CONGRESSIONAL STAFF

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Cultivating Diversity and Improving Retention Among Congressional Staff''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 21, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2722, a bill to protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure used to carry out such elections, and for other purposes, 9 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Intellectual Property and the Internet, hearing entitled ''The Federal Judiciary in the 21st Century: Ideas for Promoting Ethics, Accountability, and Transparency'', 9 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, June 24

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1790, National Defense Authorization Act, post-cloture.

At 5:30 p.m., all post-cloture time will expire and Senate will vote on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, June 21

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Continue consideration of H.R. 3055—Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barr, Andy, Ky., E809
Bergman, Jack, Mich., E811
Biggs, Andy, Ariz., E805
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E812
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E804, E806
Conaway, K. Michael, Tex., E803
Crist, Charlie, Fla., E811
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E807
Cummings, Elijah E., Md., E809
Flores, Bill, Tex., E809
Gomez, Jimmy, Calif., E808
Gonzalez, Vicente, Tex., E810
Green, Al, Tex., E803
Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E803, E804
Hern, Kevin, Okla., E805
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E806
Katko, John, N.Y., E804
Keating, William R., Mass., E812
Kelly, Trent, Miss., E808
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E805, E805, E807, E808
Marshall, Roger W., Kans., E806
McNerney, Jerry, Calif., E811
Meng, Grace, N.Y., E808
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E805
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E807, E810
Pappas, Chris, N.H., E810
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E809
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E804
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E808
Rose, Max, N.Y., E803
Rouzer, David, N.C., E805
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E803
Sherman, Brad, Calif., E810
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E806
Takano, Mark, Calif., E811
Taylor, Van, Tex., E811
Westerman, Bruce, Ark., E808

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.