House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 27, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Veronica Escobar to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

Nancy Pelosi,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

God, You created us endowed with freedom. We give You thanks for giving us another day.

As Congress heads into a recess to celebrate the Fourth of July, America’s national holiday, may all citizens be mindful of the wonder of our Nation’s inception.

Men and women of goodwill from various backgrounds and sections of the Colonies from disparate faith traditions came together in prayer and united by a vision of political and economic autonomy, courageously placed their lives, their liberty, and their fortunes on the line to found these United States.

May all Americans be renewed in their commitment to our representative government. May each American expect of themselves intelligent participation in the political process so that the Members of Congress they elect might be statesmen and -women who are able to represent the interests of their constituents while also faithfully honoring their oath to defend the Constitution in doing what is best for our Nation.

In all the celebrations of this week to come, may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Ms. Pingree. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. Pingree. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. Brown of Maryland 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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3401, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SECURITY AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER ACT, 2019

Mr. McGovern, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-130) on the resolution (H. Res. 466) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

IT IS TIME TO PUT HARRIET TUBMAN ON THE $20 BILL

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

Mr. Brown of Maryland. Madam Speaker, it is time to put Harriet Tubman on the $20 bill.

The Treasury has had this design in the works for years, and now, all of a sudden, it is backpedaling. It takes 10 years, they say, to complete this work. During a 10-year period, Harriet Tubman made 19 round trips on the underground railroad to lead over 300 slaves to freedom; and, in less time, Treasury can’t put this American hero on a piece of paper.

How long must it take to reflect our Nation’s rich diversity on our currency?

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

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, I rise today to recognize the hardworking students, teachers, and staff at DuBois Area Middle School. For the fourth consecutive time, DuBois Area Middle School was one of over 465 schools from around the country named as a school to watch by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform.

The Schools to Watch recognition is based on a comprehensive 3-year review of the entire school. Only one other middle school in Pennsylvania has remained at the top with DuBois for their continuous designations. The students, teachers, and faculty members have joined together to create a learning community where everyone is supported. Every year, the community is challenged to maintain their success by continuing to put their best foot forward. This week, they were recognized for their 12 years of excellence. A group of women from my district, 20 of them, created a nonprofit called Bay Area Border Relief. They are in McAllen right now. They took 490 boxes of clothes, and it was actually reduced in less than 2 weeks. We need to address this issue now.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT GENERAL ROBERT SCOTT WILLIAMS ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant General Robert Scott Williams as he retires after 32 years of service to the United States Air Force.

On June 20, General Williams completed his tenure as dual commander of Air Forces Northern and First Air Force headquarters at Tyndall Air Force Base, capping a long and distinguished career.

His service to the Air Force included a tour as commander of the 169th Operations Group and Fighter Wing at McEntire Joint National Guard Base in South Carolina.

General Williams’ leadership during and after Hurricane Michael was top-tier. He and his team at Tyndall Air Force Base overcame numerous obstacles and exceeded expectations by opening First Air Force headquarters way ahead of schedule. This is only 2 short months after the category 5 storm Michael devastated the panhandle.

Madam Speaker, I applaud the work he has accomplished over his last 3 years of command and his 32-year career. Please join me in saluting Lieutenant General Robert Scott Williams for his great service to the Air Force.

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN GROWN FLOWERS MONTH

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Speaker, this is not my America. This is not the values of our America. Look at this picture. Now, some critics think that this should not have been published, but I disagree, because these people are not rapists or murderers or drug dealers. This is Oscar Ramirez and his 23-month-old daughter, Angie Valeria. They died on the Rio Grande River. Angie clinging to Oscar’s neck and tugged under his shirt in a desperate attempt to survive.

Their story isn’t unique. Last Saturday, a mother and three children were found dead in U.S. soil. Children have been found freezing. We now know that many of them don’t even have simple items of hygiene like soap and toothbrushes.

A group of women from my district, 20 of them, created a nonprofit called Bay Area Border Relief. They are in McAllen right now. They took 490 boxes of clothes, and it was actually reduced in less than 2 weeks. We need to address this issue now.

In my home State of Maine, where I represent many small farms, more than 250 farms sell cut flowers, from the Snell Family Farm in Buxton to Lazy Acres Farm in Farmingdale. This is an industry worth upwards of $1 million to our economy and has seen such rapid growth in recent years that we have many flower CSAs for local customers. The new interest in locally sourced flowers has allowed farmers to diversify their crops and boost their income.

In Maine, nationally recognized as “Vacationland,” cut flowers are essential to our tourism industry. Flowers decorate wedding venues, hotels, and restaurants across our State. And when you are celebrating something as special as a wedding or a long-awaited vacation, shouldn’t everything, down to the flowers on the table, have some meaning?

HIGHLIGHTING THE DAIRY MARGIN COVERAGE PROGRAM

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

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the end of Dairy Month, which is recognized throughout June. I also rise to highlight the USDA’s new Dairy Margin Coverage program, which is enrolling farmers right now.

My district in upstate New York is home to hundreds of dairy farmers, and way too many are struggling to survive with years of plummeting milk prices. Now at the mercy of not just a complex pricing system, but also trade wars, our farmers need real support. I
encourage all dairy farmers in New York’s 19th Congressional District to begin making coverage decisions.

The Dairy Margin Coverage program is retroactive until the beginning of the year, with applicable payments following soon after enrollment.

As dairy farmers continue to face low prices and increased market consolidation, I hope this program will provide much-needed support during this challenging farm economy.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I am deeply committed to supporting our dairy farmers, and I will be closely following implementation of the Dairy Margin Coverage program. I will continue fighting to give our farmers the support and the certainty they need.

RECOGNIZING JUDY GENSHAFT

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

Mr. BILIRIKIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Dr. Judy Genshaft, a truly outstanding leader whose contributions to the Tampa Bay area as the sixth president of the University of South Florida have been unmatched, in my opinion.

President Genshaft has completely transformed USF by helping it achieve elite status as a preeminent research university. The National Science Foundation has ranked USF as one of the Nation’s top 25 research universities.

Under Judy’s leadership, USF has nearly quadrupled its research portfolio to expand lifesaving research and develop cutting-edge technologies. The school’s success has attracted some of the brightest young minds to the Tampa Bay area of Florida, growing enrollment by 40 percent, and USF’s graduation rate has tripled with Dr. Genshaft at the helm.

Summarizing the many accomplishments of President Genshaft in just 1 minute is impossible. She is a remarkable woman who has made the Tampa Bay region a better place. As she prepares to retire, it is my honor to say congratulations to her.

Go Bulls.

CARING FOR THE CHILDREN

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

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, there is a Gospel reading I like: Matthew 25: “For I was hungry and You gave me food, I was thirsty and You gave me drink, a stranger and You welcomed me, naked and You clothed me, ill and You cared for me, in prison and You visited me.”

That spirit of welcoming and compassion is a part of what defines us as Americans. In fact, we have enshrined it in our legal code, including laws requiring safe and sanitary conditions for migrant children. Yet right now, children are imprisoned in appalling and unconscionable conditions.

These children have not been welcomed in the spirit of Matthew. Instead, they are in cages, in prison without adequate food, clean clothing, clean diapers, toothbrushes, access to showers, and a comfortable place to lay their head.

“Whatever you did unto the least of these, you did unto me.”

Madam Speaker, we will be judged as a nation, as a government, and a people for our failure to look out for the least of these. May this imprisonment end.

SECURING AMERICA’S FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 460, I call up the bill (H.R. 2722) to protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure necessary to carry out such elections, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 460, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration printed in part A of House Report 116–126, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2722

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Securing America’s Federal Elections Act” or the “SAFE Act”.

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

TITLE I—FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE

Subtitle A—Voting System Security Improvement Grants

Part 1—Promoting Accuracy, Integrity, and Security Through Voter-Verified Permanent Paper Ballot

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Paper ballot and manual counting requirements.

Sec. 103. Accessibility and ballot verification requirements for individuals with disabilities.

Sec. 104. Durability and readability requirements for ballots.

Sec. 105. Paper ballot printing requirements.

Sec. 106. Study of report on optimal ballot design.

Sec. 107. Effective date for new requirements.

Part 2—Grants to carry out improvements

Sec. 111. Grants for obtaining compliant paper ballot voting systems and carrying out voting system security improvements.
"(1) PRESERVATION AS OFFICIAL RECORD.—The individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballot used in accordance with clause (i) shall constitute the official ballot and shall be preserved and used to count any recounts or audits conducted with respect to any election for Federal office in which the voting system is used.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT CLARIFYING APPLICABILITY OF ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS UNDER VOLUNTARY VOTING SYSTEM GUIDANCE.—In adopting any voluntary guidance under subtitle B of title III of the Help America Vote Act with respect to the accessibility of the voting systems under this Act, the Election Assistance Commission shall include and apply the same accessibility standards applicable under the voluntary guidance adopted for accessible voting systems under such subtitle.

(c) DURABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PAPER BALLOTS MARKED BY BALLOT MARKING DEVICE.—All voter-verifiable paper ballots completed by the voter through the use of a ballot marking device shall be durable and reusable, even if destroyed or damaged by fire, water, or other severe weather events, and shall contain a permanent paper record of the vote selections made by the voter.

(d) PRINTING REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS.—All paper ballots used in an election for Federal office shall be printed on recycled paper manufactured in the United States.
"(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this section on January 1, 2020.

"(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 105(b) of the Securing America’s Federal Elections Act and subparagraphs (B) and (C), the requirements of this section which are first imposed on a State and jurisdiction pursuant to the amendment made by the Voter Confidence and Increased Accessiblity Act of 2019 shall apply with respect to voting systems used for any election for Federal office held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

"(B) DELAY FOR JURISDICTIONS USING CERTAIN PAPER RECORD PRINTERS OR CERTAIN SYSTEMS USING DIRECT RECORDING ELECTRONIC VOTING MACHINES.—In the case of a jurisdiction which uses paper record printers attached to directly recording electronic voting machines, or which used other voting systems that used or produced paper records of the voting behavior of voters and the proprietary requirements of such systems that used or produced paper records of the voting behavior of voters, subparagraph (A) shall apply to a voting system in the jurisdiction as if the reference in such subparagraph to ‘2020’ were a reference to ‘2022’, but only with respect to the following requirements of this section:

"(I) Paragraph (i)(ii) of subparagraph (a) (relating to the use of voter-verifiable paper ballots).

"(II) Paragraph (3)(B)(iii)(I) and (II) of subsection (a) (relating to access to verification from and casting of the durable paper ballot).

"(III) Paragraph (7) of subsection (a) (relating to durability and readability requirements for ballots).

"(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR JURISDICTIONS USING CERTAIN NONTABULATING BALLOT MARKING DEVICES.—In the case of a jurisdiction which uses non-tabulating ballot marking devices which automatically deposit the ballot into a privacy sleeve, subparagraph (A) shall apply to a voting system in the jurisdiction as if the reference in such subparagraph to ‘any election for Federal office held in 2020 or any succeeding year’ were a reference to ‘elections for Federal office occurring held in 2022 or each succeeding year’, but only with respect to paragraph (3)(B)(iii)(I) of subsection (a) (relating to nonmanual casting of the durable paper ballot)."

"PART 2—GRANTS TO CARRY OUT SEC. 111. GRANTS FOR OBTAINING COMPLIANT PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AND CARRYING OUT VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

"(a) AVAILABILITY OF GRANTS.—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

"(b) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—The amount of a grant under this section (b), the Commission shall make such pro rata reductions in such amounts as may be necessary to ensure that the amount appropriated under this section is distributed to the States.

"(c) DURABLE PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AVAILABLE WHEREEVER ELECTRONIC MACHINES ARE USED.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall, in determining the amount of funds appropriated for grants authorized under section 297d(a)(2) exceed the amount necessary to meet the requirements of subsection (b), the Commission shall consider the following in making a determination to award remaining funds to a State:

"(1) The record of the State in carrying out the following with respect to the administration of elections for Federal office:

"(A) Providing voting machines that are less than 10 years old.

"(B) Implementing strong chain of custody procedures for the physical security of voting equipment and paper records at all stages of the process.

"(C) Conducting pre-election testing on every voting machine and ensuring that paper ballots are available wherever electronic machines are used.

"(D) Maintaining offline backups of voter registration lists.

"(E) Providing a secure voter registration database that logs requests submitted to the database.

"(F) Publishing and enforcing a policy detailing use limitations and security safeguards to protect the personal information of voters in the voter registration process.

"(G) Providing secure processes and procedures for reporting vote tallies.

"(H) Providing a secure platform for disseminating vote totals.

"(2) Evidence of established conditions of innovation and reform in providing voting system security and the greatest extent practicable, an eligible State shall be permitted to use the amount of the grant calculated under subpart (C) for purposes described in paragraph (3), except that such amount may not exceed the product of $1 and the average waiting period for an individual who is eligible to cast a vote in the election at the polling place the opportunity to cast the vote using a blank preprinted ballot which the individual may mark by hand under the following in making a determination to award remaining funds to a State:

"(i) To replace a voting system which does not meet the requirements which are first imposed on the State pursuant to the amendment made by the Voter Confidence and Increased Accessiblity Act of 2019, or

"(II) To implement and model best practices for ballot design, ballot instructions, and the testing of ballots.

"(b) ABILITY OF REPLACEMENT SYSTEMS TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS PART.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall make such pro rata reductions in such amounts as may be necessary to ensure that the amount appropriated under this section is distributed to the States.

"(c) PRO RATA REDUCTIONS.—If the amount of the grant calculated under subparagraph (b) is insufficient to ensure that each State receives the amount of the grant calculated under subsection (b), the Commission shall make such pro rata reductions in such amounts as may be necessary to ensure that the amount appropriated under this part is distributed to the States.

"(d) DURABLE PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AVAILABLE WHEREEVER ELECTRONIC MACHINES ARE USED.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall, in determining the amount of funds appropriated for grants authorized under section 297d(a)(2), exceed the amount necessary to meet the requirements of subsection (b), the Commission shall consider the following in making a determination to award remaining funds to a State:

"(1) The record of the State in carrying out the following with respect to the administration of elections for Federal office:

"(A) Providing voting machines that are less than 10 years old.

"(B) Implementing strong chain of custody procedures for the physical security of voting equipment and paper records at all stages of the process.

"(C) Conducting pre-election testing on every voting machine and ensuring that paper ballots are available wherever electronic machines are used.

"(D) Maintaining offline backups of voter registration lists.

"(E) Providing a secure voter registration database that logs requests submitted to the database.

"(F) Publishing and enforcing a policy detailing use limitations and security safeguards to protect the personal information of voters in the voter registration process.

"(G) Providing secure processes and procedures for reporting vote tallies.

"(H) Providing a secure platform for disseminating vote totals.

"(2) Evidence of established conditions of innovation and reform in providing voting system security and the greatest extent practicable, an eligible State shall be permitted to use the amount of the grant calculated under subpart (C) for purposes described in paragraph (3), except that such amount may not exceed the product of $1 and the average waiting period for an individual who is eligible to cast a vote in the election at the polling place the opportunity to cast the vote using a blank preprinted ballot which the individual may mark by hand under the following in making a determination to award remaining funds to a State:

"(i) To replace a voting system which does not meet the requirements which are first imposed on the State pursuant to the amendment made by the Voter Confidence and Increased Accessiblity Act of 2019, or

"(II) To implement and model best practices for ballot design, ballot instructions, and the testing of ballots.
of the State’s election infrastructure or designates as critical to the operation of the State’s election infrastructure.

(6) Enhancing the cybersecurity and operations of election technology infrastructure described in paragraph (4).

(7) Enhancing the cybersecurity of voter registration systems.

(b) by redlined ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE VENDORS DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this part, a ‘qualified election infrastructure vendor’ is any person who provides, supports, or maintains, or who seeks to provide, support, or maintain, election infrastructure on behalf of a State, unit of local government, or election agency, who meets the criteria described in paragraph (2).

(2) CRITERIA.—The criteria described in this paragraph are such criteria as the Chairman, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall establish and publish, and shall include each of the following requirements:

(A) The vendor must be owned and controlled by a citizen or permanent resident of the United States.

(B) The vendor must disclose to the Chairman and the Secretary, and to the chief State election official of the State to which the vendor provides any goods and services with funds provided under this part, of any sourcing outside the United States for parts of the election infrastructure.

(C) The vendor agrees to ensure that the election infrastructure will be developed and maintained in a manner that is consistent with the cyber best practices issued by the Technical Guidelines Development Committee.

(D) The vendor agrees to maintain its information technology infrastructure in a manner that is consistent with the cybersecurity best practices issued by the Technical Guidelines Development Committee.

(E) The vendor agrees to meet the requirements of paragraph (3) with respect to any known or suspected cybersecurity incidents involving any of the goods and services provided by the vendor pursuant to a grant under this part.

(F) The vendor agrees to permit independent cybersecurity testing by the Commission in accordance with section 231(a) and by the Secretary of the goods and services provided by the vendor pursuant to a grant under this part.

(3) CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A vendor meets the requirements of this paragraph if, upon becoming aware of the possibility of an election cybersecurity incident, the vendor provides notice to the Secretary and the Chief State Election Official of any State to which the vendor provides any goods and services with funds provided under this part, of any cybersecurity incident.

(i) The vendor promptly assesses whether or not such an incident occurred, and submits a notification meeting the requirements of subparagraph (B) to the Secretary and the Chairman of the assessment as soon as practicable (but in no case later than 3 days after the vendor first becomes aware of the possibility that the incident occurred).

(ii) The incident involves goods or services provided to an election agency, the vendor submits a notification meeting the requirements of subparagraph (B) to the agency as soon as practicable (but in no case later than 3 days after the vendor first becomes aware of the possibility that the incident occurred), and cooperates with the agency in providing any necessary notifications relating to the incident; and

(iii) The vendor provides all necessary updates to any notification submitted under clause (i) or clause (ii).

(B) CONTENTS OF NOTIFICATIONS.—Each notification submitted under clause (i) or clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall contain the following information with respect to any election cybersecurity incident by the notification:

(i) The date, time, and time zone when the election cybersecurity incident began, if known.

(ii) The date, time, and time zone when the election cybersecurity incident was detected.

(iii) The date, time, and duration of the election cybersecurity incident.

(iv) The type of the election cybersecurity incident, including the specific election infrastructure systems believed to have been accessed and invaded, if any.

(v) Any planned and implemented technical measures to respond to and recover from the incident.

(vi) In the case of any notification which is an update to a prior notification, any additional material information relating to the incident, including technical data, as it becomes available.

SEC. 297B. ELIGIBILITY OF STATES.

(A) A State is eligible to receive a grant under this part if the State submits to the Commission, at such time and in such form as the Commission may require, an application containing—

(1) a description of how the State will use the grant to carry out the activities authorized under this part,

(2) a certification and assurance that, not later than 5 years after receiving the grant, the State will carry out voting system security improvements as described in section 297A; and

(3) such other information and assurances as the Commission may require.

SEC. 297C. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(A) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this part—

(1) $600,000,000 for fiscal year 2019; and

(2) $175,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2020, 2022, 2024, and 2026.

(B) CONTINUING AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of this section shall remain available until expended.

(C) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of this Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:


SEC. 297. Grants for obtaining compliant paper ballot voting systems and carrying out voting system security improvements.

SEC. 297A. Voting system security improvements described.

SEC. 297B. Eligibility of States.

SEC. 297C. Reports to Congress.

SEC. 297D. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 112. COORDINATION OF VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY ACTIVITIES WITH USE OF REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS AND ELECTION ADMINISTRATION REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS ACT OF 2002.

(a) Duties of Election Assistance Commission.—Section 302(a)(3) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20982) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ‘‘by the Secretary, on the plan for use of payments under this Act of 2002,’’ and inserting ‘‘by the Secretary, on the plan for use of payments under this Act of 2002, pursuant to a grant under this part;’’.

(b) Members of the committee shall be a representative group of individuals from the State’s counties, cities, towns, and Indian tribes, and shall represent the needs of rural as well as urban areas of the State, as the case may be.’’.

(c) Ensuring Protection of Computerized Statewide Voter Registration List.—Section 302(a)(3) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21083(a)(3)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘, as other measures to prevent and respond to cybersecurity incidents, as identified by the Commission, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Technical Guidelines Development Committee.’’.

SEC. 113. INCORPORATION OF DEFINITIONS.
SEC. 901. DEFINITIONS. 

"In this Act, the following definitions apply:—


"(2) The term ‘election agency’ means any agency of a State, or any component of a unit of local government in a State, which is responsible for the administration of elections for Federal office in the State.

"(3) The term ‘election infrastructure’ means storage facilities, polling places, and centralized vote tabulation locations used to support the administration of elections for public office, as well as the information and communications technology (including the technology used by or on behalf of election officials to produce and distribute voter guides to voters), including voter registration databases, voting machines, electronic mail and other communications systems (including electronic mail and other systems of vendors who have entered into contracts with the election agencies to support the administration of elections, manage the election process, and report and display election results), and other systems used to manage the election process and report and display election results on behalf of an election agency.

"(4) The term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of this Act is amended by amending the item relating to section 901 to read as follows:—

“Sec. 901. Definitions.”.

Subtitle B—Risk-Limiting Audits

SEC. 121. RISK-LIMITING AUDITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (32 U.S.C. 2081 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

"SEC. 303A. RISK-LIMITING AUDITS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (32 U.S.C. 2081 et seq.) is amended by striking ‘‘sections 301, 302, and 303’’ and inserting ‘‘subtitle A of title II’’.

"(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after section 301 the following new item:

“Sec. 303A. Risk-limiting audits.”.

SEC. 122. FUNDING FOR CONDUCTING POST-ELECTION RISK-LIMITING AUDITS.

(a) PAYMENTS TO STATES.—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (32 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.), as amended by section 111(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

"PART 8—FUNDING FOR POST-ELECTION RISK-LIMITING AUDITS

"SEC. 298. PAYMENTS FOR POST-ELECTION RISK-LIMITING AUDITS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall pay to States the amount of eligible post-election audit costs.

"(b) ELIGIBLE POST-ELECTION AUDIT COSTS.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘eligible post-election audit costs’ means, with respect to each post-election audit conducted for a State, costs paid or incurred by the State or local government within the State for—

"(I) the conduct of any risk-limiting audit (as defined in section 303A) with respect to an election for Federal office occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

"(II) any equipment, software, or services necessary for the conduct of any such risk-limiting audit.

"(c) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) RULES AND PROCEDURES.—The Commission shall establish rules and procedures for conducting post-election audit costs for payments under this section.

"(2) INSUFFICIENT FUNDS.—In any case in which the amounts appropriated under subsection (d) are insufficient to pay all eligible post-election audit costs submitted by a State with respect to any Federal election, the amount of such costs paid or incurred by a State shall be equal to the amount that bears the same ratio to the amount which would be paid to such State (determined without regard to this paragraph) as—

"(A) the number of individuals who voted in such Federal election in such State; bears to

"(B) the total number of individuals who voted in such Federal election in all States submitting a claim for eligible post-election audit costs for payments under this section.

"(f) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act, as amended by section 111(b), is further amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subtitle D of title II the following:

“PART 8—FUNDING FOR POST-ELECTION RISK-LIMITING AUDITS

“Sec. 298. Payments for post-election risk-limiting audits.”.

SEC. 123. GAO ANALYSIS OF EFFECTS OF AUDITS.

(a) ANALYSIS.—Not later than 6 months after the first elections for Federal office is held for which States must conduct risk-limiting audits under section 303A of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (as added by section 121), the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an analysis of the extent to which such audits have improved the administration of such elections and the security of election infrastructure in the States receiving such grants.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report on the analysis conducted under subsection (a) to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.
(a) BALLOT TABULATING DEVICES.—Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20501(a)), as amended by section 104, and subsection (a) is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(10) PROHIBITION OF USE OF WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS DEVICES IN SYSTEMS OR DEVICES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—No system or device upon which a voting system tabulates ballots by hand or through the use of an optical scanning device that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B), and

(B) REQUIREMENTS FOR OPTICAL SCANNING DEVICES.—In this subsection, the requirements of paragraph (C), the requirements of this subparagraph are as follows:

(i) The device is designed and built in a manner in which it is mechanically impossible for the device to add or change the vote selections on a printed or marked ballot.

(ii) The device is capable of exporting its data (including vote tally data sets and cast vote records) in a machine-readable, open data standard format required by the Commission, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(iii) The device consists of hardware that demonstrably conforms to a hardware component manifesting the one-time output of the device, including upstream hardware supply chain information for each component that—

(I) has been provided to the Commission, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the chief State election official for each State in which the device is used; and

(II) may be shared by any entity to whom it has been provided under subclause (I) with independent experts for cybersecurity analysis.

(ii) The device utilizes technology that prevents the operation of the device if any hardware components do not meet the requirements of clause (iii).

(iii) The device operates using software for which the source code, system build tools, and compilation parameters—

(I) have been provided to the Commission, the Director of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security, and the chief State election official for each State in which the device is used; and

(II) may be shared by any entity to whom it has been provided under subclause (I) with independent experts for cybersecurity analysis.

(iv) The device utilizes technology that prevents the running of software on the device that does not meet the requirements of clause (v).

(v) The device utilizes technology that enables election officials, cybersecurity researchers, and voters to verify that the software running on the device—

(I) was built from a specific, untampered version of the code that is described in clause (v); and

(II) uses the system build tools and compilation parameters that are described in clause (v).

(vii) The device contains such other security requirements as the Director of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security requires.

(c) SPECIAL CYBERSECURITY RULES FOR CERTAIN BALLOT MARKING DEVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20501(a)), as amended by section 104, and subsection (b) is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(12) BALLOT MARKING DEVICES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a voting system that uses a ballot marking device, the ballot marking device shall be a device that—

(I) is not capable of tabulating votes;

(ii) except in the case of a ballot marking device used exclusively to comply with the requirements of paragraph (3), is certified in accordance with the requirements of this paragraph by the Election Assistance Commission, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or recognized in accordance with the requirements of subparagraph (B); and

(iii) meets the requirements of clauses (ii) through (vii) of section 301(a)(12)(B).

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A ballot marking device meets the requirements of this subparagraph if, during a double-masked test conducted by a qualified independent user experience research laboratory (as defined in section 232(b)(4) of a simulated election scenario which meets the requirements of clause (i), there is less than a 5 percent chance that an ordinary voter using the device would not detect and report any difference between the vote selection printed on the ballot by the ballot marking device and the vote selection input by the voter.

(ii) SIMULATED ELECTION SCENARIO.—A simulated election scenario meets the requirements of this clause if it is conducted with—

(I) a pool of subjects that are—

(aa) diverse in age, gender, education, and physical limitations; and

(bb) representative of the communities in which the voting system will be used; and

(II) ballots that are representative of ballots ordinarily used in the communities in which the voting system will be used.

(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR TESTING.—

(1) I N GENERAL.—The testing of whether the ballot marking device intended to be used by the State or jurisdiction meets the requirements of this section by the Election Assistance Commission in accordance with standards determined by the Commission, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(2) CRITERIA.—A laboratory shall be accredited under this subsection only if such laboratory—

(I) has no employee of, or individual with an ownership in, such laboratory, has or had during the preceding 5 years, any financial relationship with a manufacturer of voting systems; and

(ii) has an independent review board established under this subsection.
“(B) QUALIFICATIONS.—The members of the independent review board—

(i) shall have expertise and relevant peer-reviewed publications in the following fields: cognitive science, experimental design, statistics, and user experience research and testing; and

(ii) may not have, or had during the 5 preceding years, any financial relationship with a manufacturer of voting systems.

“(C) CERTIFICATION.—If—

(i) a ballot marking device is determined by the qualified independent user experience research laboratory to meet the requirements of section 301(a)(2); and

(ii) the report submitted under subsection (b)(3)(C) is approved by a majority of the members of the independent review board under subsection (d)(2),

then the Commission shall certify the ballot marking device.

“(D) PROHIBITION ON FEES.—The Commission may not charge any fee to a State or jurisdiction for conducting a test under subsection (a).

“(E) TESTING.—The Commission shall conduct a test for the purposes of this section in the manner required by the qualified independent user experience research laboratory.

“(F) REPORTS.—The Commission shall make public—

(1) the findings of the test conducted in accordance with subsection (a); and

(2) a report submitted by the manufacturer of the ballot marking device, or any other person in connection with the test, a developer or manufacturer of a ballot marking device, or any other person in connection, a developer or manufacturer of a ballot marking device may not charge any fee to a State or jurisdiction for conducting a test under subsection (a).

“(H) USE OF SOFTWARE AND HARDWARE FOR WHICH INFORMATION IS DISCLOSED BY MANUFACTURER.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by sections 104, 105, 201(a), 201(b), and 201(c), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) ELECTRONIC CYBERSecurity GUIDELINES.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of the Securing America’s Federal Elections Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall—

(A) issue a technical guideline, including standards and best practices for procuring, maintaining, testing, operating, and updating election systems to prevent and deter cybersecurity incidents.”.

SECTION 203. REQUIRING USE OF SOFTWARE AND HARDWARE FOR WHICH INFORMATION IS DISCLOSED BY MANUFACTURER.

(A) REQUIREMENT.—Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by sections 104, 105, 201(a), 201(b), and 201(c), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) ELECTRONIC POLL Book DEFINED.—In this Act, the term ‘electronic poll book’ means the total combination of mechanical, electromechanical, or electronic equipment (including the software, firmware, and documentation required to program, control, and support the equipment) that is used—

(I) to maintain a list of registered voters; or

(II) to perform other duties in an election for Federal office.

(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR ELECTRONIC POLL BOOKS.—In the case of the requirements of subsection (c) (relating to electronic poll books), each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with such requirements on or after January 1, 2020.”.

SECTION 204. TREATMENT OF ELECTRONIC POLL BOOKS AS PART OF VOTING SYSTEMS.

(A) INCLUSION IN DEFINITION OF VOTING SYSTEM.—Section 301 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(b)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “this section” and inserting “this Act”;

(2) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (1);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) any electronic poll book used with respect to the election; and

(B) DEFINITION.—Section 301 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081) is amended—

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

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

“(C) ELECTRONIC POLL BOOK DEFINED.—In this Act, the term ‘electronic poll book’ means the total combination of mechanical, electromechanical, or electronic equipment (including the software, firmware, and documentation required to program, control, and support the equipment) that is used—

(I) to maintain a list of registered voters; or

(II) to perform other duties in an election for Federal office.

(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR ELECTRONIC POLL BOOKS.—In the case of the requirements of subsection (c) (relating to electronic poll books), each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with such requirements on or after January 1, 2020.”.

SECTION 205. PRE-ELECTION REPORTS ON VOTING SYSTEM USAGE.

(A) REQUIREING STATES TO SUBMIT REPORTS.—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 301 the following new section:

“SEC. 301A. PRE-ELECTION REPORTS ON VOTING SYSTEM USAGE.

(A) REQUIREING STATES TO SUBMIT REPORTS.—Not later than 120 days before the date of each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the Chief State Election official of a State shall submit a report to the Commission containing a detailed voting system usage plan for each jurisdiction in the State which will administer the election, including a detailed plan for the usage of electronic poll books and other equipment and components of such system.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2020 and every succeeding regularly scheduled general election for Federal office.”.

(C) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The title of the item relating to section 301 of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 301 the following new item:

“Sec. 301A. Pre-election reports on voting system usage.”.
outcomes. Ineffective and vulnerable equipment can also discourage participation in Federal elections.

It comes to the floor after the Committee on House Administration held three hearings in the first 6 months of this last Congress. All three are essential to the integrity of our elections. In February the committee held the “For the People: Our American Democracy” hearing, where the integrity of our democracy—including critical steps to improve the security and reliability of our election infrastructure—was discussed.

On May 8 the committee held an election security hearing where we heard testimony about the urgent need to upgrade our election infrastructure and the lack of ongoing investment in the wake of new threats.

And on May 21 the committee held an oversight hearing of the Election Assistance Commission, an agency that plays a central role in supporting election administration in this country.

This year I will remind this House that earlier this year, the Director of National Intelligence published a report stating that our adversaries and strategic competitors “probably already are looking to the 2020 U.S. elections as an opportunity to plant doubt and sow distrust.”

“They may also use cyber means to directly manipulate or disrupt elections systems—such as by tampering with voter registration or disrupting the vote tallying process—either to alter data or to call into question our voting process.”

Last year he said that “the warning lights are blinking red.”

Special Counsel Robert Mueller noted in Volume One of his report that the Russian military “targeted individuals and entities involved in the administration of the elections. Victims included U.S. State and local entities, such as State boards of elections, secretaries of state, and county governments, as well as individuals who worked for those entities. The GRU also targeted private technology firms responsible for manufacturing and administering election-related software and hardware, such as voter registration software and electronic polling stations.”

In April, FBI Director Christopher Wray called Russia’s interference efforts a “significant counterintelligence threat,” and said that the 2018 midterms were a “dress rehearsal for the big show” of the 2020 Presidential elections.

Early voters in Georgia in 2018 saw machines deleting votes and switching them to other candidates. The machines where voters saw this occur were purchased in 2002. During early voting in Texas in 2018 some electronic voting machines deleted votes and switched them between candidates. The machines were used in 78 of 254 Texas counties.

In June of 2016 the Russian GRU compromised the computer network of the Illinois State Board of Elections by exploiting a vulnerability in their website. They gained access to a database with information on millions of Illinois voters and extracted data on thousands before the activity was detected.

H.R. 2722 responds to this emergency that we find ourselves in as a nation. We ought to be doing everything we can to bolster the security and integrity of our elections from interference and hacking.

The bill’s section 102 requires that States transition to voting systems that use individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots, which means a paper ballot marked by the voter by hand or through the use of a non-tabulating ballot-marking device or system. Voter-verified paper ballots are the best way to ensure that a voter’s ballot accurately reflects their choices and is counted as cast. Paper can be audited. In the last Presidential elections, electronic Xerox Accuvote systems may not receive regular security patches and are thus more vulnerable to the latest methods of cyberattack.

This bill addresses many other cybersecurity best practices besides paper-based systems.

The bill in section 111 authorizes a $600 million Election Assistance Commission grant program to assist States in securing election infrastructure. States may use the money to replace their aging equipment with voter-verified paper ballot voting systems, but also ongoing maintenance of election infrastructure, enhanced cybersecurity and operations of IT infrastructure, and enhanced end-to-end security of voter registration systems.

Originally, the bill, as introduced, would have authorized $1 billion for this initial round of surging funds; however, during the Committee on House Appropriations markup, the committee approved an amendment in the nature of a substitute that authorized $600 million instead. Combined with the $380 million that Congress appropriated last year in election security grants, this funding reaches the $1 billion that experts have said is necessary to implement these necessary protections.
The bill also provides in section 111 $175 million in biennial maintenance funding. Cybersecurity threats will not dissipate, they will only evolve. State election officials have told us repeatedly they need more funding and a sustained funding.

Section 103 of the SAFE Act fosters innovation for voters living with disabilities. It provides grant funding for the study, development, and testing of accessible paper ballot voting, verification, and casting mechanisms. It expressly requires States to ensure that individuals with disabilities and others are given an equivalent opportunity to vote, including with privacy and independence, in a manner that produces voter-verified paper ballots as for other voters.

The bill fosters accountability for election technology vendors. It would create a qualified election infrastructure, permitting States to adopt risk-limiting audits. They involve hand counting a certain number of ballots using advanced statistical methods to determine with a high degree of confidence that the reported election outcome is accurate. The SAFE Act requires election infrastructure vendors to implement risk-limiting audits because they go hand in hand with paper ballots. We need audits to ensure that ballot marking devices or optical scanners were not hacked and that the reported results are accurate.

Second, as amended in committee, the bill in section 201 includes specific cybersecurity standards to apply to optical scanner voting systems and another set of standards to apply to ballot marking devices. These will apply equally to current and future technology. For example, H.R. 2722 prohibits the use of wireless communications devices and internet connectivity in voting systems which are not marked by voters or that otherwise mark and tabulate ballots.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2722 is an essential step forward in shoring up our election infrastructure and investing in secure elections. I ask the House to pass this legislation and bolster the trust and confidence in our system that all Americans expect and deserve. Every American—no matter what their choice in politics—should know that their vote will be counted as cast. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in the 2016 election, we saw a very real threat to our Nation when Russia interfered in our elections by using social media and attacking voter registration databases. While this interference from Russia is unacceptable, I feel it is necessary to point out that there is no evidence that any voting machines were hacked in 2016 or even in the 2018 elections.

However, this does not mean that there isn’t a need for election and cybersecurity improvements for State election systems. On this point, I know my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle, including the distinguished chairperson of our Committee on House Administration, we all agree that no one—and I mean, no one—should interfere with our elections. Every American’s vote should be counted and protected.

Last Congress $380 million were appropriated to States to upgrade their election security. Also, election infrastructure was designated as critical infrastructure in response to the U.S. Intelligence Community’s reports that the Russian Government attacked.

This allowed the Department of Homeland Security to begin providing additional cybersecurity assistance to State and local election officials. Work has been done to help States improve their election security, and more work must be done. This is why our committee Republicans, all of us on the House Administration Committee, introduced H.R. 3412, the Election Security Assistance Act, to assist States in improving election security strengthening efforts. This realistic legislation provides $380 million in Federal grants to States to update their aging and at-risk election infrastructure, while also requiring State and local officials to have some skin in the game. We require a 25 percent match to ensure that they understand they are getting the best equipment that is going to protect their voters’ rights to have their votes counted.

In addition, our bill is the only bill that creates the first ever Election Cyber Assistance Unit, aimed at connecting our State and local election officials with leading election administrators and cybersecurity experts from across the country.

Our bill also empowers State officials by providing security clearances to our election officials to better facilitate the sharing of information and requiring the Department of Homeland Security to notify State election officials of cyberattacks and any foreign threats within the State.

It is common sense that if there is an attempt to hack a State election, the State election official should be notified, but they are currently not able to let a State know if it has been attacked. If DHS is the one that sees this attack from a foreign country, they notify State officials because, in many cases, they don’t have security clearance.

Our bill clears this up. Those State officials deserve the right to know who is trying to attack their elections in each State in this great Nation.

My good friend, Congresswoman Torres, stated at the Rules Committee hearing on Monday night that she doesn’t trust her State election officials in California to have security clearances. Personally, I don’t feel that way, and I think other Members of Congress may agree with me.

State officials should know if there is a threat to their election system, and DHS should be the one telling them. As amended in the committee, the Election Security Assistance Act, our solution provides much-needed election security improvements and reinforcements for local election officials, without overstepping the States’ authority to determine and maintain their own elections.

Unfortunately, I can’t say the same for the bill we are voting on today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a member of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the SAFE Act.

No matter what my colleagues conclude about the Mueller report, I think we can all agree it shows our elections are under foreign attack.

What would happen if a foreign government actually succeeded in changing the results of a Federal election?

All bad actors have to do is break through the defenses of even one—even one—of the over 10,000 election administration jurisdictions in our country.

As we all know, questionable results in just one county can derail an entire Presidential election and throw our country into a tailspin. Election security is national security. Election machinery is the machinery of democracy.

The SAFE Act gives States what they need to upgrade and maintain safe and resilient election infrastructure.

In the House Administration Committee, we debated whether paper ballots are the safest way to go. It does seem ironic that our answer to cybersecurity, in fact, is old school, but we know what works.

As Oregon’s Secretary of State Dennis Richardson said, “You can’t hack paper.” We can recount and audit paper ballots with a certainty that we just don’t have with machines.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to
the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, keeping our elections safe from cyberattacks and fraud is not and should not be a partisan priority.

H.R. 2722 has been rushed to the House floor without giving the Science, Space, and Technology Committee the opportunity to hold even a single hearing on the bill or the subject matter.

The problem with rushing this bill through Congress is that it will have a significant negative impact on NIST’s ability to work with State and local governments to identify standards and best practices for election security.

Our priority in Congress should be to develop useful tools that empower States and local officials to ensure their elections are secure, accessible, and accurate.

In fact, our secretary of state in Indiana, Ms. Connie Lawson, has done a remarkable job leading the effort to add safeguards to our elections process, ensuring it is completed with integrity.

Given the opportunity, I believe that our committee could come to an agreement, in a bipartisan manner, to update NIST’s election security and activities.

Congress should focus on legislation that provides meaningful improvement and reinforcements for local officials without overstepping the States’ authority to maintain their elections.

Madam Speaker, because of the lack of following regular order, the committee has never been given the opportunity to ensure those issues are addressed.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a member of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the SAFE Act because Vladimir Putin conducted a sweeping misinformation campaign to disrupt and destabilize our Presidential election in 2016.

Some say we can’t pass the SAFE Act to guarantee the security of our elections, that because of federalism, we should let the States work it out on their own.

But we are not the fragmented, divided States of America. We are the United States of America, and that is the way we were designed.

Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution, Madam Speaker, says Congress “shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion.”

What does it mean by “republican form of government”? It doesn’t mean a Republican Party form of government. It means a representative form of government, and as such, we must have a system that accurately translates the popular will into the election of a Congress.

This is a massive technical challenge in a country of hundreds of millions of people, 50 States, and thousands of jurisdictions, especially in the computer age. We need voter-certified, paper-ballot voting systems in every State in the Union that can withstand attacks.

We need real accountability for election vendors. We need voting machines manufactured in the United States, where our democracy is created, too.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I certainly hope my good friend from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) changes his mind and wants more Republican governments, but I don’t think that is going to happen, even today, on the House floor.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Yoho).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Illinois for yielding.

I rise today as a Member from the great State of Florida. We all recall what happened in Palm Beach County turned into a national punchline, the hang chad.

The Democratic bill before us today would mandate paper ballots and make our elections a technology-free zone. I, too, am worried about malign actors like Russia and China when it comes to our cybersecurity network. However, let us not throw out the baby with the bath water.

Many of my colleagues submitted commonsense amendments that would improve the bill, amendments addressing ballot harvesting and ensuring State matching funds. Yet, Democrats, under another closed rule, are forcing passage on a one-sided bill with no prospect in the Senate and no chance of being signed by the President.

Madam Speaker, I sincerely hope we address these issues in a bipartisan manner today, all on this body and the American people.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mrs. McBath), a new Member of Congress.

Mrs. McBATH. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2722. Our elections are the foundation of our democracy, but they face increasing threats.

There is bipartisan agreement that we must do more to guard against these threats to our most fundamental democratic process. Our elections must allow us to truly hear the voices of every American voter.

My home State of Georgia has recently taken steps to safeguard its voting processes from cybersecurity threats, and this bill would provide necessary funding to support these efforts in Georgia and across our country.

This legislation will strengthen the partnership of the Election Assistance Commission, the Department of Homeland Security, and our State election officials.

Together, we must modernize our election infrastructure and ensure the security of our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this critical measure.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Yoho) for purposes of the rule.

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, the SAFE Act’s election security is especially significant to Floridians. Two Florida counties were breached in the 2016 election as a result of Russian spear phishing targeting county election officials.

As Members of Congress, obviously, we are not here to relitigate 2016 but to work toward bipartisan solutions to defend the 2020 elections from foreign intrusion.

I am disappointed that the majority is rushing this partisan proposal to the floor this week and has bypassed Republicans who have shown interest in working on election security. Just yesterday, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee held a hearing on election vulnerabilities and potential solutions, which came after—after—this proposal had been introduced and a day before it will receive a vote on the House floor.

This proposal throws $1.3 billion at the problem without careful consideration by the authorizing committees. This proposal also excludes bipartisan solutions, like the one I am drafting with Representative STEPHANIE MURPHY from Florida.

Our proposal, the ALERTS Act, would require Federal agencies to report to the Department of Homeland Security if an election intrusion is identified and require DHS to notify State and local officials of the breach, unless the information is deemed to compromise intelligence sources.

Federal, State, and local officials have a duty to notify voters in Florida and voters across the country impacted by election attacks, a duty that was not upheld by the FBI in the wake of the 2016 elections and a duty that the ALERTS Act, this bipartisan proposal, would require.

At yesterday’s Science, Space, and Technology Committee hearing, the secretary of Oklahoma’s State Election Board recommended a State and local reporting requirement like the ALERTS Act.

So, testimony and a recommendation—both—were not considered by the authors of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I request that my colleagues oppose this bill, and immediately following this vote, I ask Democrats and Republicans to come together to work toward a bipartisan election security package.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2722, the SAFE Act.

Our proposal, the ALERTS Act, would require Federal agencies to report to the Department of Homeland Security if an election intrusion is identified and require DHS to notify State and local officials of the breach, unless the information is deemed to compromise intelligence sources.

Federal, State, and local officials have a duty to notify voters in Florida and voters across the country impacted by election attacks, a duty that was not upheld by the FBI in the wake of the 2016 elections and a duty that the ALERTS Act, this bipartisan proposal, would require.

At yesterday’s Science, Space, and Technology Committee hearing, the secretary of Oklahoma’s State Election Board recommended a State and local reporting requirement like the ALERTS Act.

So, testimony and a recommendation—both—were not considered by the authors of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I request that my colleagues oppose this bill, and immediately following this vote, I ask Democrats and Republicans to come together to work toward a bipartisan election security package.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2722, the SAFE Act.

Among the many disturbing revelations of the Mueller report, we learned that Russian intelligence officers successfully infiltrated the computer network in my home State at the Illinois
Mr. CASTEN, my colleague. We want the SAFE Act on the floor today. I urge my colleagues to vote for the SAFE Act. Our elections and our voters are safe in the upcoming election.

Our democratic system depends on the consent of the governed. That is far too fragile to take lightly. And our constituents’ trust and the independence of our democracy depend on it.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote for the SAFE Act on the floor today.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, look, I respect and agree with my good friend from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN), my colleague. We want to protect our home State. We saw intrusion into our Illinois State Board of Elections voter registration system. It is something that had to be addressed.

I am happy to report, after talking with the State Board of Election officials, the given resources already appropriated by a Republican majority Congress, Republicans in the Senate, and President Trump last year to effectively ensure that that information is not vulnerable again.

What we are debating here today is a bill that will put more unfunded and underfunded mandates on States like Illinois. That is not what our local election officials in my district asked for.

The reason Illinois was able to protect itself and ensure that it didn’t happen again in the extremely high, historic turnout of the 2018 midterm election was because they were given the flexibility to spend the HAVA funds that Republicans in Congress ensured that the State of Illinois had, leading to a Democratic majority in the midterm elections.

No one is questioning the safety and security of our midterm elections. No one has attacked any foreign entity hacked into any institution, voter registration system, or machines. Maybe DHS hasn’t called me, even though I think I have a security clearance, so they could.

But they can’t call our local election officials, under this bill, if it happens again because they don’t have security clearance. That is why our bill is a better choice.

The vote that is on the floor today does not address the concerns of States like mine, and it certainly does not address the concerns of States like California.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, as a Member from California, it is hard for me to believe that the majority could possibly propose an election security bill that doesn’t address the major vulnerabilities related to ballot harvesting.

Ballot harvesting is where paid campaign operatives collect up to hundreds or even thousands of ballots and drop them off at polling places or an election office. The practice is ripe for fraud and a recipe for disaster. Any serious effort to secure elections would address it.

Let’s be clear: We want to give people who need it an opportunity to vote by mail, and we want to look for ways to make it easier for disabled or elderly Americans to participate in our elections. My concern is inserting campaign operatives into the ballot-handling process without any safeguards.

In California, paid campaign staff can collect hundreds of ballots without having to disclose who they are working for. When they hand over those ballots to election officials, there is no requirement to even provide their name. Some of my friends across the aisle claim that the real problem is bad actors committing fraud. But it is the very practice of ballot harvesting being the problem. The reality is this process is an open invitation for fraud. That is why most States have banned the practice.

Ignoring the most notable threat to election security is unacceptable in a so-called election security bill.

Madam Speaker. American voters deserve better. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill until we can get serious about real election security. Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker. In 2016, Russians attempted to break into Virginia’s election system. In response to this information, Virginia took active steps to secure the integrity of our elections. We spent up our transition to paper ballots to ensure that our elections were secure and the results could be verified and audited.

But it is not just about any one election or just about any one adversary. Passing the SAFE Act is about securing our elections from all threats, foreign or otherwise. These threats are coming for us in every State, red or blue, rural or urban.

In 2016, State election websites in Illinois and Arizona were hacked by intruders that installed malware and downloaded sensitive voter information.

In 2018, electronic voting machines in Georgia and Texas deleted votes for certain candidates or switched votes from one candidate to another.

In Johnson County, Indiana, e-poll books failed in 2018, halting voting entirely for 4 hours, with no extension of polling hours.

It is clear that Congress must take action. Passage of the SAFE Act will secure our elections by updating our election infrastructure, speeding up the transition to paper ballots, and making necessary investments in cybersecurity.

Every Member of Congress took an oath to protect this Nation from threats foreign and domestic, and I urge my colleagues to honor that oath. Let’s protect our democracy while we still have one.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), my fellow House Administration Committee Republican and one of my good friends here in Congress.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Illinois, an exceptional baseball player, as well, for yielding this time.

Look, this is something I am very passionate about, and I am a bit surprised that one of my colleagues from Georgia would speak against this bill or even support this bill.

Let’s be frank. Yes, the Russians are bad. They are very bad. They seek to divide us, to America, and they have been attempting to influence our elections for many years.

Yes, we need to be concerned about election security. But if you want to secure our election system, this is the exact opposite of what we should be doing.

The State of Georgia has recognized this. Just this year, our State legislature overwhelmingly passed a bill to spend $150 million to upgrade our electronic voting machines so that they will produce a verifiable ballot that represents the way the person voted at the machine.

This is the direction we should be going, not to eliminate electronic ballots, not to eliminate the efficiency that you get when you can walk in.

The verifiable aspect of it, a voter is given a card, after it is verified who the voter is. When a voter walks into a voting precinct, they fill out the paper and show their ID, and they are given a card that identifies that they have been certified. They insert that card and vote electronically, and then it will produce a printed receipt that they can verify that this is the way they voted. That receipt goes into a box that is used for a recount. That is a secure voting system that also embraces technology.

This bill would take us back decades. It is like when a student takes an SAT exam. They fill out the little bubbles, and then it runs through an electronic counter.

Look, even in our own hearing, the chief technologist at the Center for Democracy and Technology agreed when I brought this scenario to them that we use the technology of DREs that then will print a verifiable ballot or a receipt. He said that those were abso- lutely safe.
Now, here is the problem. When we go to paper ballots, and everyone is going to fill out these paper ballots, we are talking long lines. We are talking about fewer people being able to get to the polls.

Madam Speaker, when we decide to vote on this bill, the last thing you are going to say from that rostrum is Members will cast their votes via electronic device. Why? It is efficient. We have a verifiable way of making sure that you can see the way we voted on this board up here or on a printed piece of paper we can get in the back. This is because of efficiency.

Madam Speaker, can you imagine if we had to do paper ballots or voice vote every one of the many amendments we have on these appropriations bills? We would never go home. We would be here 24 hours a day.

The American people expect us to live by the standards that they have to live by. We should embrace technology and make it secure, not revert back decades to old technology.

Look, the reality is, this bill would subject us to the problem of people walking up with boxes full of preprinted ballots, all across the Nation, and they could drop those in at the last minute. We need to verify that people voting are who they are.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my colleague from the House Judiciary Committee and Homeland Security Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership.

There is not a time that I go home that they don’t ask me how we will secure our elections. I am proudly supporting the bipartisan American’s Federal Elections Act, the SAFE Act, and I am asking why our colleagues are fighting against Americans having the right to vote.

The SAFE Act authorizes a $600 million Election Assistance Commission grant program. It provides States with $175 million in biannual sustainment funding to help maintain election infrastructure.

Voting machines are required to be manufactured in the United States. States are mandated to conduct risk-limiting audits.

Another very important feature of the SAFE Act is that it requires accountability for election technology vendors and sets cybersecurity standards.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, recognizing what happened in 2016, I want to make sure that the agencies, the Russian military, are not our poll watchers, are not our secretaries of states, are not the vendors for our machines.

I want to make sure for minorities, every vote counts, and for every American, every vote counts. I want to end voter suppression. The way we do this is to have safe elections.

I am very proud of this legislation, and I am proud of this Speaker, proud of the leadership, to say that we are going to be first on the line to tell America we believe in safe, equal, and fair elections.

I ask my friends to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2722, the “Securing America’s Federal Elections Act” or SAFE Act.

I strongly support this legislation because the linchpin of representative democracy is public confidence in the political system, regime, and community.

That confidence in turn rests upon the extent to which the public has faith that the system employed to select its leaders accurately reflects its preferences.

At bottom, this means that all citizens casting a vote have a fundamental right and reasonable expectation that their votes count and are counted.

This concern is particularly salient because of the unprecedented interference by a hostile foreign power to secure victory for its preferred candidate in the 2016 presidential election and the determination of that hostile power to repeat its success in future American elections.

That is why it is necessary to pass H.R. 2722, the SAFE Act, so comprehensive election security reform measures can be implemented.

Specifically, the SAFE Act authorizes a $600 million Election Assistance Commission (EAC) grant program to assist in securing election infrastructure and a $5 million grant program to study and report on accessible paper ballot voting systems.

The bill provides grants to State and local election officials to replace aging voting machines with voter-verified paper ballot voting systems and grants to support hiring IT staff, cybersecurity training, security and risk vulnerability assessments, and other activities to secure election infrastructure.

The bill also assists States with $175 million in biannual sustainment funding to help maintain election infrastructure.

Under the legislation, voting machines are required to be manufactured in the United States and states are mandated to conduct risk-limiting audits.

Another very important feature of the SAFE Act is that it requires accountability for election technology vendors and sets cybersecurity standards.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, recognizing what happened in 2016, I want to make sure that the agencies, the Russian military, are not our poll watchers, are not our secretaries of states, are not the vendors for our machines.

I want to make sure for minorities, every vote counts, and for every American, every vote counts. I want to end voter suppression. The way we do this is to have safe elections.

I am very proud of this legislation, and I am proud of this Speaker, proud of the leadership, to say that we are going to be first on the line to tell America we believe in safe, equal, and fair elections.

I ask my friends to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2722, the “Securing America’s Federal Elections Act” or SAFE Act.

I strongly support this legislation because the linchpin of representative democracy is public confidence in the political system, regime, and community.

That confidence in turn rests upon the extent to which the public has faith that the system employed to select its leaders accurately reflects its preferences.

At bottom, this means that all citizens casting a vote have a fundamental right and reasonable expectation that their votes count and are counted.

This concern is particularly salient because of the unprecedented interference by a hostile foreign power to secure victory for its preferred candidate in the 2016 presidential election and the determination of that hostile power to repeat its success in future American elections.

That is why it is necessary to pass H.R. 2722, the SAFE Act, so comprehensive election security reform measures can be implemented.

Specifically, the SAFE Act authorizes a $600 million Election Assistance Commission (EAC) grant program to assist in securing election infrastructure and a $5 million grant program to study and report on accessible paper ballot voting systems.

The bill provides grants to State and local election officials to replace aging voting machines with voter-verified paper ballot voting systems and grants to support hiring IT staff, cybersecurity training, security and risk vulnerability assessments, and other activities to secure election infrastructure.

The bill also assists States with $175 million in biannual sustainment funding to help maintain election infrastructure and, to ensure States can maintain security gains, provides each State with no less than $1 per voter who participated in the most recent election to maintain election security.

Under the legislation, voting machines are required to be manufactured in the United States and states are mandated to conduct risk-limiting audits, a critical tool to ensuring the integrity of elections.

These audits involve hand counting a certain number of ballots and using statistical methods to determine the accuracy of the original vote tally, are effective at detecting any incorrect election outcomes, whether caused by a cyberattack or something more mundane like a programming error.

The SAFE Act also directs the National Science Foundation to administer a $5 million grant program to study and report on accessible paper ballot verification mechanisms, including for individuals with disabilities, voters with difficulties in literacy, and voters whose primary language is not English.

Madam Speaker, another salutary feature of the SAFE Act is that it requires accountability for election technology vendors and sets cybersecurity standards and prohibits wireless and internet connectivity on systems that count ballots or upon which voters mark their ballots or systems are configured.

The SAFE Act also limits state expenditures on goods and services with grant monies provided under this Act to purchases from “qualified election infrastructure vendors,” which includes maintaining IT infrastructure in a manner consistent with the best practices provided by the EAC and agreeing to report any known or suspected security incidents involving election infrastructure.

Madam Speaker, there is compelling reason for the Congress to pass the SAFE Act by overwhelming margins in the House and Senate because to date the President and his administration has shown little interest or inclination in taking effective action to deter and prevent interference by foreign powers in American elections.

Let us remember that the Intelligence Community Assessment (“ICA”) of January 2017 assessed that Russian President Vladimir Putin interfered in an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election in which Russia’s goals were to undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrate Democratic presidential candidate and implacable foe of Vladimir Putin, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, facilitate the election of Vladimir Putin’s preferred candidate, Donald J. Trump.

Russia’s interference in the election processes of democratic countries is not new but a continuation of the “Translator Project,” an ongoing information warfare effort launched by Vladimir Putin in 2014 to use social media to manipulate public opinion and voters in western democracies.

Instead of supporting the unanimous assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community, the President attacked and sought to discredit and undermine the agencies and officials responsible for detecting and assessing Russian interference in the 2016 presidential election as well as those responsible for investigating and bringing to justice the conspirators who committed crimes against the United States our law enforcement.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

The EAC, in coordination with DHS, establishes the criteria for achieving the status of “qualified election infrastructure vendor,” which includes maintaining IT infrastructure in a manner consistent with the best practices provided by the EAC and agreeing to report any known or suspected security incidents involving election infrastructure.

Madam Speaker, there is compelling reason for the Congress to pass the SAFE Act by overwhelming margins in the House and Senate because to date the President and his administration has shown little interest or inclination in taking effective action to deter and prevent interference by foreign powers in American elections.

I ask my friends to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, we should embrace technology 24 hours a day. We would never go home. We would be here 24 hours a day.

We should embrace technology 24 hours a day.
Madam Speaker, American elections are to be decided by American voters free from foreign interference or sabotage, and that is why I support and urge all my colleagues to vote to pass H.R. 2722, the “Securing America’s Federal Elections Act” or SAFE Act.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), our Republican Policy Committee chair.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois, who is also a good friend, for the work he is doing on this, trying to bring some transparency to what is really going on here.

There are numerous reasons that mandating paper ballots isn’t workable. They are susceptible to fraud; they are inefficient; and they are antiquated. I have seen, over the years, where the joke was “one man, one vote,” where it was “one suitcase, one vote,” with people bringing in paper ballots, sending a situation around the country now where that is still a bit of a problem.

For argument’s sake, though, let’s just say that paper ballots were foolproof and didn’t come with their own set of security concerns. I would still be concerned about the impact this bill would have on the majority of our States.

The mandate, in and of itself, is troubling. Twenty-nine out of the 50 States, plus the District of Columbia, would have to completely revamp their current election systems. This is both costly and time-intensive. There is nearly zero chance this can be adopted by the 2020 elections. The funding in the bill makes it clear that they realize this is not enough money to pay for this and, if it is not, it would be on a pro rata share. That means it is an unfunded mandate in violation of the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act.

It is easy for Federal lawmakers here in D.C. to gloss over the impact this Federal mandate would have, but the numbers don’t lie. Only 18 States currently use a paper-only voting system, as the bill would mandate. Not to mention, this bill would also impact those 18 States, including my home State of Alabama.

Just a few days ago, the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology held a hearing on “Election Security: Voting Technology Vulnerabilities,” where Oklahoma’s Secretary of the State Election Board Ziriax pointed out that this bill would require the use of recycled paper, which would be impossible to use with Oklahoma’s current paper ballot system because the fibers found in recycled paper would cause repeated false readings.

While this may seem like a small or silly detail, this is just one example of the great impact this bill will have on all States, with many considerations that have yet to be vetted properly.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield the gentleman from Alabama an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PALMER. My colleagues on the other side continue to offer radical and unworkable policies to revamp our election system. Security risks do exist within our ballot boxes, but this bill is not the answer. This bill will just add to the existing risks, and I cannot support it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 14 minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARABANES).

Mr. SARABANES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I very strongly support the SAFE Act. This is something that the Democrats have been focused on from day one. Day one meaning, the day after the 2016 election, when we saw the attacks that had come in against our democracy, we realized we were very exposed, and we needed to take action.

This is our chance to stand up against interference from foreign adversaries who are trying to hack in, sow discord, undermine our elections, and create havoc here in our own country. This is fundamental to protecting our democracy.

So we were on the case from the beginning. We convened the Election Security Task Force, which was led by Zoe LOFGREN, Bob Brady, Bennie THOMPSON and others. They looked at all of the best practices that we need to put in place to make sure that our elections are strong and sturdy, and how do we fortify them, and they produced those recommendations.

We then took those recommendations and we put them into H.R. 1, the For the People Act, and we passed those on March 8 of this year, because we knew that this was a priority and that there is no time to waste.

Now, our Republican colleagues, unfortunately, did not want to go along with those broad, sweeping reforms that were contained in H.R. 1, including election security measures. So we made it easy for them, we said, “Okay. We will start to break those things out. We will take the election security piece and we will bring it as a separate bill to the floor of the House.” That is the SAFE Act. But we still, apparently, don’t have their support.

This is their opportunity, this is their chance to stand up and show their patriotism, to defend our democracy, to protect our Constitution, to make sure that our elections are going to be safe.

So let’s talk about what is in the SAFE Act, the Safeguarding America’s Federal Elections Act.

We have significant resources that are going to be brought to bear to build up, to fortify the election infrastructure of our country. This is what the public wants to see. They want to be ready for the 2020 election. They want to have risk-limiting audits to make sure that States across the country are figuring out what is going on. Where do we make changes? How do we protect ourselves?

Paper ballots. We have had a lot of discussion about that today. Paper ballots. It’s incredibly important in terms of boosting the confidence of the public that elections will be carried out in a way that you can verify the tally, people have the confidence that when they go to the ballot box, they put their ballot in there, that their vote will be counted.

We have no time to waste. We need to get this done now if we are going to be ready for the 2020 election.

Bob Mueller came along with his report and he said the Russian interference was sweeping and systematic in 2016.

Every leader in our intelligence community has also echoed the fact that 2016 was a dress rehearsal. They are coming in 2020.

We need to be ready. We need to protect our elections. Let’s support the SAFE Act.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I agree with my good friend from Maryland. We as Republicans and Democrats need to do the patriotic thing and make sure that our elections are protected.

And I do agree that the Russians tried to interfere in our election process with misinformation campaigns. But I also want to ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if their concentration on election security happened the day after the 2016 election, why in the world didn’t the administration who was in the White House at the time when the intelligence analysts were talking about how other foreign entities, including Russia, were wanting to interfere in our elections, why didn’t they do something about it?

Why are we here today?

Why didn’t it happen before the 2016 election, when our intelligence analysts said nefarious activity was moving against the United States of America?

They did nothing. The Obama administration did nothing. They let it go.

Now we are here watching the new Democrat majority that was elected in 2018, after explosive turnout in our midterm elections, their first bill, H.R. 1, that every member of the Democratic majority cosponsored and supported, that is the solution?

The solution is to add millions of taxpayer dollars and then the first ever corporate dollars for their own congressional campaign accounts?

No one has ever said that is the solution to too much money in politics or...
to election security. Not one time have I had a constituent say that to me.
Now, we have got to come together and do what is right.
We have yet to address any of the issues that were laid out in the Mueller report and are debating a ‘green light’ to the Russians to do it. This is a discussion about what happened in 2016 without a discussion of what is needed in our States and local election authorities.

That is what is wrong with this bill, too. It is hypocrisy at its greatest.
Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.
Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, the chair of the House Administration Committee, Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIES, heard from yesterday; Mr. RASKIN; Mr. ASKIN; Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON, for the work that he has been doing with this task force and his committee and other members who are working with him as we go forward.
We are pleased that the administration has agreed to provide an all-Member briefing on election security that will happen in July, so we can get the facts. We have been trying to get the facts.

Some people around here may think that it is okay to just make policy with the facts.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

Madame Speaker, as we approach the Fourth of July holiday, I urge my colleagues to remember the oath we took and the democracy we defend, to come together strong and take action. The House will do our patriotic duty to protect America.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

The GOP Senate and the White House are giving foreign countries the green light to attack our country, but the House will do our patriotic duty to protect America.
and our intelligence officials to notify our State and local election officials if they see nefarious activity, but right now under the bill we are debating today, that would not be the case, because in many cases, DHS won’t talk to local election officials or State election officials because they don’t have security clearances.

Our bill, pushed by the Republicans on the House Administration Committee, would allow the communication to take place.

You know, we hear a lot of talk about patriotism coming up on the Fourth of July. I believe we are all patriots in this institution, but I believe, also, we have to govern together.

We were working on a bipartisan solution to election security, and all of the sudden, we were told no more negotiations. That is not how I thought this institution worked. I thought we could work together.

Well, I do want to respond to a couple of comments that my colleague from California made. She may have mentioned H.R. 1. H.R. 1 was the Democrats’ attempt to address not only too much money in politics, they said; they also wanted to address election security.

Clearly, what H.R. 1 did was do nothing to affect the money that is coming into politics, and it is not doing enough to ensure that our elections are not impacted by foreign entities with nefarious intentions.

Our bill today that we hoped could have been debated but was voted down on a party-line vote in the House Administration Committee earlier this week, just a few days ago, we hoped we could have come up with that, this is a bipartisan solution that would have worked. What works, our last speaker said, was this. Clearly, that is not what works.

What works isn’t voting for a bill like H.R. 1, that votes to put the first ever corporate money directly into every Member of Congress’ campaign accounts. What works, clearly, is not taxpayer money to fix that problem when there are not enough corporate malfeasance funds. That is not what the American people wanted.

And what would have worked would have been the last administration, the Obama administration, listening to their intelligence agencies and doing something about nefarious activities before the 2016 election, not the day after, when Democrats decided to take this issue on.

And then all I ever hear is they are going to blame Mitch McConnell. Well, before that, before 2016, the Obama administration ceded Presidential authority to the Senate majority leader. I had no idea that happened.

Everything is Mitch McConnell’s fault, right? He is the one who told the intelligence community to stand down. Are you kidding me?

And now we hear we should have done something. You are darn right we should have done something. You are darn right the Obama administration should have done something. You are darn right they should have done it when they first heard about it before the 2016 election, and now here we are to fix it.

And today’s bill is clearly not a fix. We have got some issues, and it is really interesting to see my colleagues from California come up and not want to address a practice like ballot harvesting. The State of North Carolina, a Republican who did it is likely to go to jail for it, but the same process is legal in the State of California—disastrous.

You want to talk about trying to determine the outcome of elections? We have put forth amendment after amendment to address ballot harvesting, with complete party-line votes against making sure the process that is illegal in North Carolina that a Republican operative will likely go to jail for is completely legal in States like California.

And you want to talk about determining the outcome of an election? Come on.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), my good friend.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Illinois for yielding this minute to me.

The distinguished Speaker talked about misinformation out there about elections and election security and a lot of that that goes on around here. Let’s be factual here.

There has been zero solid evidence of voter suppression during the last election, which had the largest turnout in the history of this Nation. Our own committee held seven field hearings across the Nation, with zero solid evidence of voter suppression, but the only way to suppress that is that they tried to bring up had to deal with purging voter rolls.


But yet this is the direction we are going in, and the distinguished Speaker said we are taking it into the 21st century. Show me how. How is this taking us into the 21st century? It is taking us back decades.

Look, if the Russians were actually physically invading our Nation with bombers and tanks, this bill would be the equivalent of giving our military pelot guns and paper airplanes to thwart the attack. This is taking us away from election security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), a valued member of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I thank the chair of our committee for yielding me time this morning.

Madam Speaker, I rise this morning in strong support of H.R. 2722. It is past time that this Congress act boldly in response to the foreign interference that took place in our 2016 elections, and that is exactly what this bill does.

The gentleman from Ohio, the ranking member of the committee, says to him it is disingenuous to point the finger at the Obama administration. That may or may not be accurate, but let us look forward.

This legislation provides $600 million in grants to State and local officials to secure election infrastructure and replace aging voting machines with voter-verified paper ballot voting systems; $175 million to States every 2 years to maintain elections infrastructure. It requires States to implement risk-limiting audits; it prohibits internet accessibility or connectivity for devices on which ballots are marked or tabulated; and it sets long-needed cybersecurity standards for vendors.

Last year my colleagues, let us look forward. Let us protect the right to vote. Let us protect the ballot of every American citizen.

Mr. ROYDEN DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I really respect my colleague from North Carolina, and I do want to correct him a little bit.

I am from Illinois, not Ohio. I would never mistake the gentleman from North Carolina as being from someplace like South Carolina. But the gentleman from North Carolina is a good friend.

Look, we all have disagreements on this House floor, but that doesn’t mean we are disagreeable when it comes to having good friendships, and I thank him for his courtesies and thank him for his friendship.

The State of North Carolina is a great example of why we need to do better. Why we fought to go back to the drawing board.

Let’s take this bill off the floor. Let’s get back to bipartisan negotiations, because in States like North Carolina and States like Illinois where local election officials have bought machines, they bought machines, maybe they have current optical scan machines, but the requirement in this bill, as the Oklahoma secretary of state said, the requirement of this bill to have recycled ballots through ballots that are already purchased optical scan machines that would be required for every local and State election official to purchase after the year 2022 may not be able to read the ballots on recycled paper. So you are going to have to reinvest hard-earned tax dollars where many local communities in our great States have already invested in updating their election security with the most secure election equipment that they felt was going to protect them.

We absolutely cannot be telling our local officials what to buy, especially when there are provisions in this bill that make equipment that would fit
those guidelines illegal to use or are inoperable even if they have purchased it. We have got to do better.

We all want to protect this great Nation. We all want free and fair elections so that every vote is counted and protected. Let’s do it together. Let’s do it right.

Let’s make sure we address some DHS concerns. Let’s put a cybersecurity assistance unit together like we have tried to do.

Let’s boil down the harvest, because I know we have got bipartisan support in working together on that issue, especially with my good friend from North Carolina, Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I look forward to working with him on this. I know he and I both have concerns about this process, and I thank him for his willingness to sit down and talk.

We can do better. The bill on the floor today is not better. Let’s do it. Let’s work together. Pull this bill off the floor. We got a lot of other issues to debate today.

I yield myself the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, we have no additional speakers, so if the gentleman would like to yield back, I will close.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The gentleman from Illinois has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, well, clearly the timekeeper is wrong. I obviously thought I had more, but I am not able to debate that today. I will go ahead and close.

I do want to thank my colleague from California and also the members of the House Administration Committee, where we have an opportunity to come together, but this bill is just simply another partisan bill by the majority aimed at federally mandating election standards, like mandating that States exclusively use paper ballots, effectively banning any type of digital recording device that would have even a verified paper backup.

There had once been one hearing on this issue with Commissioners from the EAC—remember, that agency that one speaker earlier said was getting a pittance of dollars, small amounts of dollars over the last few years. Only in this institution is $380 million given by the Republican majority here in the House in the last Congress and signed into law by the President of the United States, only in this institution is $380 million a little bit. A lot of that money still has not been spent by our local election officials.

So here we are today debating a bill that is going to basically commit 1.3 billion taxpayer dollars toward so-called election security. We still have not addressed the problem that if DHS, if our same intelligence officials who told the Obama administration that there was foreign interference in our 2016 elections and the Obama administration did not—because, why? Because of MITCH MCCONNELL. It is MITCH MCCONNELL’s fault. Seriously, come on. Get real here. We are legislators. We are an equal branch of government. There is absolutely no way the administration cedes authority to anybody in this legislative institution.

The Obama administration failed to address the problem of election interference and so now we are doing this—trying to make sure that we fix it. This attempt to fix it is a partisan attempt at ensuring that our elections authorities and our States and our local election officials have a top-down, federally mandated approach that is going to potentially cost them millions of taxpayer dollars that they have already inserted into their own budgets over the last few years.

Our local officials have told us they want flexibility. Cybersecurity concerns are where they have invested much of the $380 million that we put forth in the last Congress.

Let’s make sure we spend the money that we have already appropriated; let’s make sure we take a common-sense approach; and let’s give our election officials, Republicans and Democrats from throughout this great Nation, the ability to address the concerns they know are weakest in their own system. Let’s not have some bureaucrat out here in a concrete building determining what is going to work best in the State of Texas, in the State of Illinois, in the State of California, or anywhere else.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is important to address a few of the issues that have been raised in the course of this debate.

First, we are moving forward with the SAFE Act because of a sense of urgency that we have about the 2020 election. That sense of urgency was fueled by the Director of National Intelligence, and it was fueled by the Director of the FBI who told us that red lights, warning lights were flashing that the advice they got from computer scientists that what they were doing did not meet best practices for ballot security: whether we are going to allow the Russians to try to steal our election next year or not.

Mention has been made about the need for bipartisanism, I work often on a bipartisan basis with Members of the other party. I will say that we have tried in vain to have the Republican Members buy into the need to require best practices for next year’s election, and we couldn’t get agreement.

We decided that it is our responsibility to move forward, and that is why we are here today.

Just a mention on unfunded mandates, we are authorizing about $1 billion. $380 million was appropriated last year, and as the Speaker mentioned, we are appropriating this year an additional $600 million for ballot security.

This bill authorizes the $600 million that we are appropriating, and we think it is important that that money flow to the States to harden our systems so the election cannot be stolen by our enemies. It is ironic that some on the other side of the aisle have complained about unfunded mandates at the same time they tried to impose a 25 percent match requirement on States for receiving these funds that they need to get to harden our system.

Just a comment on DREs, DREs are not as unsafe as pure electronic voting, but they are not best practices.

Much has been mentioned about the State of Georgia. It is worth noting that the Georgia legislature ignored the advice they got from computer scientists that what they were doing did not meet best practices for ballot security.

A study published by Georgia Tech indicated that most voters did not actually look at the receipt when it was printed. They also point out that even though printed ballots do look at them, include the names of candidates, votes will be encoded in barcodes that humans can’t authenticate and that are subject to hacking.

“There’s nothing speculative about these vulnerabilities,” said a Georgia Tech computer professor and former chief technology officer for Hewlett-Packard. “If exploited, it would affect the result of the election. It’s not a secure system.”

This is designed to fix these things not because it is partisan but because we need to protect America.

I think the idea that we would allow this to just be decided at a local level is...
Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 466.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed in section 425 of that same act. House Resolution 466 makes in order a motion “without intervention of any point of order.” Therefore, I make a point of order, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget Act, that this rule may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule and the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member of the Rules Committee have each been granted 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

Madam Speaker, the bill before us today provides no CBO cost estimate, so we literally have no idea as to whether or not there are additional unfunded mandates being imposed on the States. We do know that the States are already having to use their scarce resources to deal with this border crisis, and the legislation before us today does nothing to alleviate that.

Indeed, my colleague from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) made that very point and offered an amendment, which was rejected by the committee, to consider reimbursing the State of Texas over $800 million for their expenses. Those same kinds of expenses—probably not to that magnitude—have been undertaken by other States. Madam Speaker, we don’t think that we should proceed until we have that information and the House has a chance to consider that.

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

Madam Speaker, the bill that we would consider today, if they are successful, frankly, is something we know the Senate is unlikely to accept. I have not heard from the President, but given the scope of the changes inside the bill, these are all changes that, in some cases, failed yesterday in the Senate—reductions in spending for the military and for the Border Patrol—that the administration has already signaled they will reject.

There is a simple solution here. We could simply take the Senate bill up, pass it, and then get some kind of compromise support on both sides of the aisle—get that bill down to the President, and the money could start flowing immediately. If we proceed as my friends want to proceed, we are simply going to be playing ping-pong back and forth.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am surprised that my colleagues on the Republican side hold this institution in such low esteem. We are the House of Representatives. Our voice matters.

On this issue, the House voted first on a measure to try to help provide some assistance to these children at the border. Then the Senate passed a different version. The way it is supposed to work is we have a negotiation and we try to come to agreement and compromise. So the idea that somehow we don’t care in the House, that we shouldn’t matter in the House, that we should just accept whatever the Senate does, to me, I find under U.S. custody at our border. Everybody has read the news articles and everybody has seen the pictures. We have a moral obligation to move forward. To try to delay consideration of a bill to help these children I think is a mistake.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), my good friend and the ranking Republican member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Oklahoma for leading this discussion.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the question on consideration. We should be taking up the Senate-passed bill. It has already been mentioned that it passed 84–8.

We don’t have a CBO score for the changes made by the House amendments to the bill, and without a CBO score, we don’t know the cost this bill would have on State and local governments.

Yesterday, in a budget hearing on matters of immigration, we heard testimony from the mayor of Yuma, Arizona, which clearly demonstrates the economic impacts and costs that States and local governments are incurring due to the crisis at the border. My friends just said changes made by the House on this Senate-passed bill take tens of millions of dollars away from the Department of Defense for reimbursement and limit the ability of Customs and Border Patrol to adequately pay for the services incurred as a result of this ongoing crisis.

Madam Speaker, Democrats have had many opportunities to advance bipartisan solutions that would provide the kind of relief to these communities and begin to address the crisis at the border; and for nearly 2 months, they have refused to act.

This week has been an unfortunate loss of precious time. This is a situation where Congress clearly needs to come together and act swiftly. I am sorry to say we are falling short in this basic obligation of the duties of the Congress of the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, again, I rise in support of the question that we have under consideration.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am a little confused. My Republican friends say they want to delay things to have a CBO score, then they say they want to get something to the President’s desk right away. They can talk all they want about a CBO score; we are going to talk about the children.

It is an emergency, and what is happening to those children on the border is unconscionable. It should weigh heavily on the hearts of every single person in this Chamber—Democrats and Republicans, alike.

Enough is enough. We need to make sure that we not only provide the necessary resources to alleviate this crisis, but we need to make sure that those resources we provide are provided in such a way that they do go to the purposes that we want them to go to. And as far as the Department of Defense money, I mean, the bottom line is this administration has been diverting funds from the Department of Defense for this stupid wall, and they have created that crisis.

The bottom line is we are here for the children, and, again, I urge my colleagues to stop the bickering and get down to business. Let us pass this rule; let us go on to pass the legislation; and let us get a deal with the Senate that is better than what is on the table right now.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGovern. I will not yield. I do not have enough time to yield.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, the gentleman has mischaracterized my statement.

Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the time.

Mr. McGovern. Madam Speaker, I would like us to make sure we provide resources to the border that actually alleviate the crisis.

I do not want to be part of an effort to send money to the border to be diverted for whatever this President wants. He has shown us where he is on this issue of the children and on the issue of immigration. And, quite frankly, many of us on this side of the aisle—and, I think, some on the other side of the aisle—are offended by that. So we want to make sure, when we say we are providing relief to this crisis that is affecting so many children, that, in fact, we are providing relief to those children. And that is all we are saying here.

Madam Speaker, strengthening requirements for children's health, why would anybody in the Senate want to be opposed to that?

Tightening restrictions for children's safety, people are dying in our custody. We should want to prevent that from ever occurring again by supporting nonprofits and community caring for children's well-being.

Madam Speaker, this stuff is something that should not be controversial no matter how you look at it, and yet it is for my Republican friends, and I regret that very much.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I am puzzled as well. I am puzzled why this wasn't dealt with 8 weeks ago when the administration asked. I am puzzled why, for 16 times when we tried to bring this matter up on the floor, our friends in the majority rejected that.

Now we are in a hurry. Well, if we are in a hurry to act is to take the vehicle that has actually passed the United States Senate in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion and send it to the President of the United States.

That is not what my friends want to do. They want to prolong the debate. They have prolonged it for 8 weeks, by not taking the matter up. They are prolonging it today by not taking what has already been passed and moving along.

Obviously, we oppose this rule, and we want to move on. We will be happy to work with them to move on the Senate legislation. I think it would pass in an overwhelmingly bipartisan way; the President would sign it; and that aid would begin flowing. What my friends are proposing is quite the opposite. It is a prolonged back-and-forth with the United States Senate.

I have deep respect for our institution, but what is going to come out of here is going to be partisan; what came out of there is bipartisan.

What is going to come out of here won't be signed by the President; what has come out of the United States Senate will be. So if they are in a hurry to get the money moving, that is the way we should proceed.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Madam Speaker, let me remind my colleagues, this is not the House bill that passed. This is a compromise that we have moved forward.

And, again, here is what my friends are saying is partisan: that we put into this bill that for children's health we must ensure a higher standard for medical care, nutrition, and hygiene. That is what they are calling partisan. That is what they are saying, oh, it is awful, we can't move forward on that.

The bill we are putting forward, this compromise bill, will meet the needs of the children. That is all that it does. So I don't know why we in the House can't, in a bipartisan way, stand together and say: Look, we want to improve on what the Senate did, and we want to guarantee that the moneys we send actually go to help the children and not get diverted to other things like we know this administration has a habit of doing.

Madam Speaker, anybody who has seen the pictures in the newspapers recently, anybody who has read the news articles, again, our hearts should ache. This is not America. This is not what our country is about. We can do much, much better, and that is why we should move forward with consideration.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 1 1/2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 1/4 minutes remaining.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close and will yield back the balance of my time at the conclusion of my remarks.

Madam Speaker, we don't think the House bill is a good idea. We don't think the Senate bill is a good idea. We think reducing the amount the Senate gave to the military by $124 million is a good idea. We think reducing the amount the Senate gave to the children's health by $1 billion is a good idea. We think this leads us to a different place.

So, obviously, we oppose this rule, and we want to move on. We will be happy to work with them to move on the Senate legislation. I think it would yield?
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A physician who visited one recently said: "The conditions within which they are held could be compared to torture facilities."

Mr. Speaker, when Lady Liberty encourages us to give her our poor, huddled masses, I don’t think she means so the administration can turn around and throw them in a cage. I don’t think she lifts her torch so their legal plight could be criminalized and crying children could be ripped from the arms of their parents.

But that is what is happening under this President, and, Mr. Speaker, it is sickening. It should tear at the hearts of every single Member of this House, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

This week, the House passed bipartisan emergency legislation to address this humanitarian crisis at the border. The Senate had its own ideas. So, today, we are back with a compromise to get a bill quickly signed into law.

This is a compromise that lives up to our core values and protects children and families. It adds critical protections for those who were included in the House version of the bill. It includes language to improve care for children by forcing influx facilities to comply with the Flores settlement and capping, at 90 days, the amount of time a child can spend in such a facility.

We are also reducing funding for ICE, while rejecting additional and unnecessary dollars for the Pentagon.

This is a crisis, Mr. Speaker. We cannot treat compromise as though it is a dirty word, not when migrants are literally losing their lives in unsafe, unhealthy, and unsanitary conditions and children are being torn apart from their families. That is what is at stake here.

The horrors at detention centers shouldn’t get lost in the latest tweet-a-thon by the President, just as the plight of migrants shouldn’t go unseen by the American people. This should shake our conscience and make clear the urgent need to act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill, and let’s send a message to the President and to the world that America is better than this. This is not who we are, what is happening at our border.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say one final thing. In the compromise package today that seems to bother so many people more morally items that would protect the well-being of these children, that would provide more transparency. For the life of me, I don’t understand the controversy. I don’t understand why we can’t make the Senate hear us why we can’t do more for these children.

I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel as we do, that what is happening is unacceptable. Let us strengthen that bill. Let us actually give a bill to the President that we all know will help these children.

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

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

I want to begin by thanking my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Chairman McCUOGERN) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am here for the third time this week and the second time on a supplemental appropriations bill for the southern border.

Earlier this week, I spoke on this floor and expressed my concerns about the House bill. Make no mistake, we need emergency funding for the crisis on the southern border. We needed it 2 months ago, and we need it even more desperately today.

Two days ago, I warned that the bill the House was considering would not pass the Senate and would not become law, and I was proven correct. The House bill failed in the Senate. In fact, it only received 37 votes in support. In contrast, the Senate amendment passed in a bipartisan vote of 84–8. If the Democratic leadership would allow a vote on the Senate text, I believe it would pass this Chamber today and be on its way to the President’s desk—today. But, instead, we are here considering a rule that would further temper the bipartisan language of provisions that have already failed to garner support in the Senate.

If this bill fails to pass the Senate, as I expect will happen, then we will be leaving town for a week without actually having anything to deal with the crisis. And I do remind my friends on the other side we have attempted on our side, 16 times, to bring up legislation to deal with this, and the President asked for this money 2 months ago.

So, I am glad they have a sense of urgency now, because we have not seen it in the past.

My sense is that this is more about maintaining the unity of the Democratic Caucus than it is about pressing legislation that can be enacted into law. But that has been true for this entire Congress, and it is why my friends have, so far, failed to enact any significant legislation during their tenure in the majority.

Mr. Speaker, we are out of time. We desperately need to get these emergency funds to the Federal agencies responsible for managing this crisis. They are out of money and need additional resources to take care of people, many of them innocent children, who are affected by this crisis. We do not have the luxury of time in responding to this emergency.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are about to make the exact same mistake that passed anything to deal on Tuesday when they pushed forward a partisan bill that would not pass the Senate and that the President would not sign into law.

What I don’t understand, Mr. Speaker, is why the majority is so resistant to acting in a bipartisan manner here. Both Republicans and Democrats agree that we need additional funding to address the crisis on the southern border. There is a real chance to send a bipartisan bill to the President that will become law. And, instead of doing what will immediately help children and families at the border, the majority is attempting to cut the needed funding from the Senate bill. The Senate Majority is riding back into it, and then send it back to the Senate, where it can fall again.

Madam Speaker, we do not have time to waste on purely political exercises. There is still an opportunity to correct this mistake, Mr. Speaker, and I would urge the majority to take that opportunity seriously.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCAURHY), the distinguished Republican leader.

Mr. MCCAURHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, 58 days—58 days—is the amount of time since the administration asked and said there was a crisis on the border, that they needed funding.

Madam Speaker, 18 times—18 times—we had the opportunity to take a vote on this floor, and we did not come to a solution, and it did not pass.

Madam Speaker, two times—two times—The New York Times wrote editorials in those 58 days calling upon this body to put politics aside, that this crisis on the border was greater than the politics that we want to play.

The Mexican Government realizes there is a crisis on the border and just sent 15,000 troops. We have seen the pictures. We have heard the words. On either side they talk of it.

We were in this well just a few days ago having a debate. Many of us said: Why would we take this moment to do a political maneuver that will not go anywhere in the Senate?

Don’t take our word for it. Take the votes for it. The bill did not pass.

There is a time for every season. The season to continue to play politics is over. The season to put people before politics is now.

Don’t take my word for it. Take the example of the Chamber that is just across the way. It is not far. You can see it if you look out those doors; you can walk it without taking much breath; and you can understand what bipartisanship looks like, Madam Speaker.

The Senate took up a bill to take up this crisis. The vote was 84–8.
Let me read the names of some of those who voted for this bill to understand what bipartisan sounds like: Senator Chuck Schumer, Senator Dick Durbin, Senator Tim Kaine, Senator Patty Murray, and Senator Diane Feinstein all voted “yes.” Every single member of the Senate Democratic leadership voted “yes” to end the crisis on the border.

But why, Madam Speaker, are we on this floor now? Why does the Democrat side want to continue to play politics when the Democrat leadership in the Senate says no?

Fifty-eight days is enough. Eighteen votes over there are too many.

But, yes, people are dying. But, yes, the money is out. We have all acknowledged it on this floor.

Madam Speaker, it makes me begin to wonder, how can a few control so many?

On that opening day, when we are on this floor, we all raise our hand individually. We all swear to uphold the Constitution. Our names are individually on the ballot when we are voted to come in here.

This is not a moment to let somebody else control your name or your voting card. This is not a moment to say, my party tells me to go here, because that is not the case.

Chuck Schumer is the leader of the Democratic Party. Dick Durbin is the leader of the Democrats when it comes to immigration. I have spent hours and months with Dick Durbin in a room trying to come to an immigration agreement; that we put the bipartisan aside; that we have swapped; that the Senate has actually taught us, given us the adult supervision to show that, yes, we have had that fight; yes, you tried to make it and it didn’t make it. But, there, is something better. There is a window, and there is an opportunity.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. Jackson Lee). The Chair would advise Members of Congress to vote for what they believe in.

I want to assure the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. Scanlon), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. Scanlon, Madam Speaker, I am so glad that our colleagues across the aisle agree that the conditions at the border are intolerable, because they are.

A few months ago, I had the opportunity to go to the southern border, meet with Border Patrol agents and advocates on the ground, including a woman who had been separated from her children, and we toured detention facilities.

The humanitarian crisis then, in February, was undeniable, and it has only gotten worse. But the cause of this crisis has raised serious questions, particularly as to why it has escalated.

In addition to suspending critical aid designed to relieve conditions causing desperate families to flee their homes, the Trump administration is failing to use longstanding laws and available resources to provide relief to children and refugees at the southern border.

The Trump administration’s policies are not making our border safer, but they are worsening the situation, at the expense of the health and well-being of desperate children and families.

There are unused beds at facilities in my home State of Pennsylvania and in Texas, and many refugee children have sponsors, family members available here, but they are being denied access.

Prior to coming to Congress, I represented immigrants and asylum seekers who, by definition, lawfully enter this country seeking refuge. I can confidently say that international law is being violated on a daily basis by this administration, and it has abandoned longstanding legal norms for processing asylees, with the apparent purpose of exacerbating the crisis for political gain.

I agree that we need to send additional resources to relieve the humanitarian conditions affecting refugees at our border. But we also have a responsibility to make sure that those resources are not misused to worsen rather than relieve this crisis.

Therefore, I urge that we support the border relief bill that is before us, which will provide resources to relieve the crisis and improve the health and well-being of innocent children, while allowing transparency and oversight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.
Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SCANLON. It is important that we allow transparency and oversight on how those funds are used.

To our Republican colleagues in the Senate, especially Majority Leader MCCONNEll, if you fail to work with us to address this humanitarian crisis, not only will your legacy be your legislative graveyard in the Senate, but the deaths of these children and families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

Mr. Speaker pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. HARTZLIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could immediately be sent to the President’s desk for his signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER of Texas), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes. It could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NEWHOUSE of Washington. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MARSHALL of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PALMER of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SPANO of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the
Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles, one from The New York Times entitled: "There is a Stench": Soiled Clothes and No Baths for Migrant Children at a Texas detention facility, and the other, "The Taliban Gave Me Toothpaste": Former Captives Contrast U.S. Treatment of Child Migrants." [From the New York Times, June 21, 2019]

A chaotic scene of sickness and filth is unfolding in an overcrowded border station in Clint, Tex., where hundreds of young people who have recently crossed the border are being held, according to lawyers who visited the facility this week. Some of the children have been there for nearly a month. Children as young as 3, many of them wearing clothes caked with snot and tears, are crying for infants they've just met, the lawyers said. Toddlers without diapers are frequently seen. The facility earlier this week said that it was housing three infants, all with teen mothers, along with a 1-year-old, two 2-year-olds and a 3-year-old. It said there were dozens more children under the age of 12 at the facility this week, found that it was housing three infants, all with teen mothers, along with a 1-year-old, two 2-year-olds and a 3-year-old. It said there were dozens more children under the age of 12 at the facility this week.

The reports of unsafe and unsanitary conditions at Clint and elsewhere release minors taken into federal immigration custody.

Ms. Mukherjee is part of a team of lawyers who has for years under the settlement been allowed to inspect government facilities where migrant children are detained. She and her colleagues traveled to Clint this week after learning that border officials had begun detaining minors who had recently crossed the border there.

She said the conditions in Clint were the worst she had seen in any facility in her 12 years of practice. She and her colleagues traveled to Clint this week after learning that border officials had begun detaining minors who had recently crossed the border there.

"There is a stench," said Elora Mukherjee, director of the Immigrants' Rights Clinic at Columbia Law School, one of the lawyers who visited the facility. "The overwhelming majority of children have not bathed since they crossed the border." Conditions at Customs and Border Protection facilities along the border have been an issue of increasing concern as officials warn that the recent surge of migrant families has driven many of the facilities well past their capacities. The border station in Clint is only one of those with problems.

In May, the inspector general for the Department of Homeland Security warned of “dangerous overcrowding” among adult migrants housed at the border processing center in El Paso, with up to 900 migrants being held at a facility designed for 125. In some cases, cells designed for 35 people were holding 155 people.

"Border Patrol agents told us some of the detainees had been held in standing-room-only conditions for days or weeks," the inspector general’s office said in its report, which noted the guards were often observed standing on toilets in the cells “to make room and gain breathing space, thus limiting access to the toilets.”

Gov. Greg Abbott of Texas on Friday announced the deployment of 1,000 new National Guard troops to the border to help respond to the continuing new arrivals, which have poured in from Mexico in record numbers in recent days, with up to 45,000 people from 52 countries over the past three weeks.

"The crisis at our southern border is unlike anything we've witnessed before and has put an enormous strain on the existing resources we have in place," Mr. Abbott said, adding, "Congress is a group of reprobates for not doing the job of the border." The number of border crossings appears to have slowed in recent weeks, possibly as a result of a crackdown by the Mexican government under pressure from President Trump, but the numbers remain high compared to recent years. The overcrowding crisis has been unfolding invisibly, with journalists and lawyers offered little access to fenced-off border facilities.

The speakers' table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MUEUSER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MUEUSER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WEBER. Madam Speaker, for the love of God and this country, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose and therefore the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WEBER. Madam Speaker, for the love of God and this country, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose and therefore the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WEBER. Madam Speaker, for the love of God and this country, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose and therefore the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WEBER. Madam Speaker, for the love of God and this country, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.
Another group of lawyers conducting inspections under the same federal court settlement said they discovered similar conditions earlier this month at six other facilities in Texas and Arizona. Border Patrol's Central Processing Center in McAllen, Texas—often known as “Urula”—the lawyers encountered a 17-year-old mother from Guatemala who described the conditions as comparable to the C-section, and who was caring for a sick and dirty premature baby.

When we encountered the baby and her mom, the room was filthy. They wouldn’t give her any water to wash her. And I took a Kleenex and I washed around her neck black dirt,” said Hope Frye, who was leading the group. “It’s not a little stuff—dirt.”

After government lawyers argued in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco this week that amenities such as soap and toothbrushes should not be mandated under the legal settlement originally agreed to between the government and migrant families in 1997 and amended several times since then, all appellate judges led by Chief Judge William A. Fletcher called the position of the Trump administration, however, that argued in the case heard on Tuesday stems from a lawsuit against the Mexican government,

If you’d like to chime in on Twitter. The case heard on Tuesday stems from a lawsuit against the Mexican government, also responded on Twitter.

The Justice Department’s lawyer, Sarah Fabian, argued that the settlement agreement did not specify the need to supply hygienic items and that, therefore, the government did not need to do so.

“Are you arguing seriously that you do not read the agreement as requiring you to do anything, or is it just described cold all night long, lights on all night long, sleeping on concrete and you’ve put an aluminum foil blanket?” Judge William Fletcher asked. “I find that inconceivable that the government would say that is safe and sanitary.”

“The Taliban gave me toothpaste: Former captives contrast U.S. treatment of child migrants” (By Deanna Paul) [June 25, 2019]

The federal government told a panel of Ninth Circuit judges last week that U.S. border detention facilities are “safe and sanitary,” as required by law, even though migrant children are denied soap, toothbrushes and access to clean beds to sleep.

Judge William A. Fletcher called the position of Sarah Fabian, a senior attorney from the Office of Immigration Litigation, “inconceivable.”

Senior U.S. Circuit Judge A. Wallace Tashima told the government attorney, “If you don’t have a toothbrush, if you don’t have soap, if you don’t have a blanket, it’s not safe and sanitary.”

Fabian’s argument spread rapidly across the Internet—and so did several tweets supporting the notion that the United States treats migrant detainees less humanely than foreign pirates and the Taliban treat their captives.

American journalist Michael Scott Moore, abducted in 2012 while reporting in Somalia, watched Fabian argue that minimal necessities, like toothbrushes and sleeping conditions, were not essential to meet minimum “safe and sanitary” standards.

“That was—let’s say—below my experience in Somalia,” he told The Washington Post Tuesday of his more than two years in captivity.

“The conditions were about as miserable as you can imagine,” he said, describing a barren and concrete prison house. Often there was no electricity, he said, “but we had certain minimum things that kept it from being completely wretched.”

And I will tell you, part of the challenge for many of us who have worked with goodwill and charity has been witnessing the fact that Congress has not been able to provide fundamental guardrails for the treatment of these kids.

What is the main difference between the Senate bill and the House bill? Ours is far more humane. Ours ensures that money will not be diverted for things that have turned a challenge into a crisis.

The House examples include ripping children from the arms of their parents or sending vulnerable populations back into Mexico. In fact, Madam Speaker, in my district, one of the individuals sent back to Mexico under this administration’s policy was kidnapped and raped. We have also seen people legally blocked at our ports of entry, sent to more treacherous crossings. That is why Oscar and Valeria died.

So oversight is why our bill is the better bill.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), my very good friend, for the purpose of unanimous consent.

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in this Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill was passed in the Senate with 84 votes, Madam Speaker, and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Kentucky (Mr. COMER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401 with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in this Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and can be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.
Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and can be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MOORE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and it could be sent to the President for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. ROSE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Illinois (Mr. BOST) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.
Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Kansas (Mr. ESTES), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the United States Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Florida (Mr. DUNN), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. GOODEN), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with only 6 nay votes from Democrats. There is overwhelming support for this in the Senate, and I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this bill today and sending it to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Kentucky (Mr. MOONEY), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President’s desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.
friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I ask that we do the right thing here. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature to solve this crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, the gentleman will state his point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, has the gentleman from Massachusetts yielded the floor by taking his seat?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has yielded the floor.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto. And if we would like to talk about accountability and if we would like to talk about oversight, I would prefer we start right here. Let your Members vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose and, therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I think you will be delighted to hear that I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Michigan (Mr. MCMULLEN).

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, it is nice to know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle now recognize it as a crisis.

The President asked 58 days ago for a supplemental appropriation to deal with this issue. It was ignored. We have tried 18 times to bring up a bill on the floor to deal with supplemental appropriations for humanitarian aid at the border, and it was ignored.

My friends on the other side of the aisle said they want to improve the bill. They want to ignore the fact that the Senate took up the House bill and overwhelmingly rejected it on a bipartisan basis.

The Senate passed a bipartisan bill 84–8, which doesn't happen over there very often. We have gone through a list of those who voted in favor, including Senator SCHUMER and Senator DURBIN, yet somehow the House wants to ignore it. At least the majority in the House want to ignore it.

How they want to improve the bill, you may ask? Well, let's start by simply reducing or eliminating border security, that appears to be optional to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They want to take a hatchet to ICE. These are law enforcement personnel.

My son is a police officer. He puts on a vest every day. If you told me we were going to withhold payroll or overtime when they are doing the job, I would be offended, I would be disgusted, and I am, at this moment in time.

Let me ask how many over there would put on a vest, go out and do the job, and then hear, we may or may not pay you? Do I see any hands raised? I doubt it.

Law enforcement is struggling to do a job, an extraordinarily tough job, and we want to make it harder. So let me suggest, as the UC request was made, that we take up the bill that was passed by the Senate and we pass it.

And I ask for your attention over there, sir. How many times have you decided that policy is being made by a fragment of your conference, unless you decided that you are going to turn over the gavel to a fragment of your conference to make decisions for you, which has appeared to be the case.

But let's be honest to the American people and tell them that a fragment, a small portion, of your conference is now functioning as a Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. What we just witnessed was really interesting. In the amount of time that it took my friends on the other side of the aisle to get through those antics, we could have passed this bill. That is what urgency looks like. Not political theater. These kids that we are here to try to protect deserve more than grandstanding. They deserve things like medicine. They deserve things like soap and clothing.

And my Republican friends say they don't want to waste time, but they wasted a hell of a lot of time with what we just saw happen.

And just one other observation. In all the other editorial comments that were made, I didn't hear the word "children" mentioned once. I mean, it is long because that is what this debate is all about. It is not about grandstanding, and it is not about more money for cages to put kids in. It is about the children. And I am sorry that the children who are suffering under U.S. custody are such an afterthought.

And to the gentleman from Michigan, I am outraged, too. I am outraged that the terrible conditions that these kids have been forced to experience happened under U.S. custody. I am outraged that that would happen in the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUR), the distinguished chairwoman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAUR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this emergency supplemental bill.

Madam Speaker, the principles guiding this bill were clear from the outset. It is a response to a humanitarian crisis.

It calls for increasing the housing capacity at Health and Human Services to move these vulnerable children from the detention centers at Customs and Border Protection as quickly as possible to Health and Human Services, because we know what the conditions are at CBP. They are deplorable. In fact, it is government-sponsored child abuse.

We wanted to build in the protections for children that have been nonexistent in the past, and we uncovered those abuses. They have been reported in the press. The Miami Herald just recently said they are "prison-like conditions" at Homestead.

And we wanted to place children with a sponsor in a safe placement, a safe environment, as expeditiously as possible to reverse the administration's policy of frightening sponsors to come forward.

This bill includes strong protections and safeguards for these vulnerable children; it extends to the influx shelters enhanced standards of care. And, my friends, it is for the first time ever. These protections have never been required of these influx shelters.

It continues to prevent the waiving of core standards and protections after 6 months.

And it continues to hold influx shelters accountable by requiring HHS to remove an operator if they do not comply with these core standards.

If the shelter is not in compliance, then HHS is required to award the contract to a new service provider, and the bill continues to protect sponsors and potential sponsors by extending a provision that prohibits funds from being used to put anyone into a removal proceeding based on information from HHS's sponsor-vetting process.

The bill continues to require HHS to maintain the directives that they issued in December that removed bureaucratic barriers and have helped to place these children with sponsors as expeditiously as possible. And the bill continues to require HHS to report to Congress within 24 hours if an unaccompanied child dies in HHS custody.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Connecticut an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DELAUR. Madam Speaker, a child did die in HHS custody. No one knew about this for 8 months, and it was only the news media that uncovered it. A child died.
This bill continues to ensure that Members of Congress can conduct over- sight visits of shelters without being required to provide advance notice, and the bill continues to protect taxpayer funding by prohibiting funds from being diverted to programs outside of Health and Human Services. This bill provides clear direction, legal guardrails, about how our emergency funds should be used, and this bill wages the battle for the vulnerable.

Madam Speaker, I urge every Member of this House to support this bill.

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amending to the rule to simply concur in the Senate amendment without further amendment. This will immediately send the bill to the President and deliver the necessary resources needed to respond to this humanitarian crisis.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, let me just say again, we can solve this problem now. I respect that my friends have strong feelings about their legislation. We all do. That is why legislation is not going to get through the Senate; it is not going to be signed by the President.

We have a vehicle that has already gotten through the Senate, that 75 percent of the Democrats in the Chamber voted for, including the entire Democratic leadership, and that could go, if this House would act on it, straight to the President’s desk and be signed into law.

Now, my friends are, I know, concerned about resources. And, again, it is nice that they are. It would have been nice if, in the 18 previous times we have tried to bring this matter up before the House, they would have helped. It would have been nice if, 2 months ago, we had actually seen them respond.

We share their concern for these young people. That is why we asked for extra resources. The administration asked for extra resources 58 days ago. So I think, again, this ought to be pretty easy to resolve here.

My friends, with all due respect, have a partisan bill that will pass along partisan lines in this House, that will not be enacted, and the Senate, that will not be signed by the President.

The Senate has a bill they have already passed in a bipartisan fashion. It, frankly, has more money to help the people deported to paying paid overtime in the Border Patrol to—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The gentleman from Oklahoma may continue.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker personally for talking control of a difficult situation.

So, Madam Speaker, just to resume my point, we have a vehicle. It could literally pass on this floor in less than an hour. It could head to the President. It satisfies almost all—not all, but almost all—of my friends’ concerns. I would just ask them, in all seriousness, to just consider political reality here. The administration investigative or law enforcement officer visited the El Paso facility in which many children were sent from Clint—called “Border Patrol Station 1”—and testified that conditions were just as bad as they were in Clint, with the same problems of insufficient food, no toothbrushes, and aggressive guards.

The problem isn’t the Clint facility. The problem is the hastily-cobbled-together system of facilities Customs and Border Protection (the agency which runs Border Patrol) has put together in the last several months, as the unprecedented number of families and children coming into the US without papers has overwhelmed a system designed to swiftly deport illegal aliens.

It is apparent that even an administration acting with the best interests of children in mind at every turn would be scrambling to respond. But policymakers are split on how much of the current crisis is simply a resource problem—one Congress could help solve by sending more resources—and how much is deliberate mistreatment or neglect from an administration that doesn’t deserve any more money or trust.

Border Patrol isn’t prepared to care for children. It’s a new housing 2,000 a day.

According to statistics sent to congressional staff last week and obtained by Vox, between May 14 and June 13, US Border Patrol facilities were housing over 14,000 people a day—and sometimes as many as 18,000.

(The most recent tally, as of June 13, was nearly 16,000.)

Most of these were single adults, or parents with children. But consistently, over that month, around 2,000—2,081 as of June 30, is the “unaccompanied” or “unaccompanied alien child.”

Children being held without adult relatives in separate facilities.

In an early June press call, a Customs and Border Protection official said, referring to the total number of people in custody, “when we have 4,000 in custody, we consider that high. 6,000 is a crisis.”

Traditionally, an “unaccompanied alien child” refers to a child who comes to the US without a parent or guardian. Increasingly—as lawyers have been reporting, and as the interior secretary who interviewed children in detention last week confirmed—children are coming to the US with a relative who is not their parent, and being separated.

Because the law defines an “unaccompanied” child as someone without a parent or legal guardian here, border agents don’t have the ability to keep a child with a grandparent, aunt or uncle, or even a sibling who’s over 18, though advocates have also raised concerns that border agents are separating relatives even when there is evidence of legal guardianship.

Under the terms of US law—and especially the 1997 Flores settlement, which governs the treatment of children in immigration custody—immigration agents are obligated to get unaccompanied children out of immigration detention as quickly as possible, and to keep them in the highest possible conditions while they’re there. Barring emergencies, children aren’t supposed to be moved to other facilities by Tuesday; about 250 of them have been placed with HHS, and the remainder are being sent to other Border Patrol facilities. But on Tuesday morning, a Customs and Border Protection official told a New York Times reporter on a press call that about a hundred children were currently being housed at Clint.

That’s illustrative of the hectic improvisation that’s characterized much of the Trump administration’s response to the current border influx. It’s a problem that is much, much bigger than the problems at a single facility. Indeed, the problems investigators identified at Clint are problems elsewhere as well.

The lone member of the House investigators who visited the El Paso facility in which many children were sent from Clint—called “Border Patrol Station 1”—and testified that conditions were just as bad as they were in Clint, with the same problems of insufficient food, no toothbrushes, and aggressive guards.

The problem isn’t the Clint facility. The problem is the hastily-cobbled-together system of facilities Customs and Border Protection (the agency which runs Border Patrol) has put together in the last several months, as the unprecedented number of families and children coming into the US without papers has overwhelmed a system designed to swiftly deport illegal aliens.

It is apparent that even an administration acting with the best interests of children in mind at every turn would be scrambling to respond. But policymakers are split on how much of the current crisis is simply a resource problem—one Congress could help solve by sending more resources—and how much is deliberate mistreatment or neglect from an administration that doesn’t deserve any more money or trust.

Border Patrol isn’t prepared to care for children. It’s a new housing 2,000 a day.

According to statistics sent to congressional staff last week and obtained by Vox, between May 14 and June 13, US Border Patrol facilities were housing over 14,000 people a day—and sometimes as many as 18,000.

(The most recent tally, as of June 13, was nearly 16,000.)

Most of these were single adults, or parents with children. But consistently, over that month, around 2,000—2,081 as of June 30, is the “unaccompanied” or “unaccompanied alien child.”

Children being held without adult relatives in separate facilities.

In an early June press call, a Customs and Border Protection official said, referring to the total number of people in custody, “when we have 4,000 in custody, we consider that high. 6,000 is a crisis.”

Traditionally, an “unaccompanied alien child” refers to a child who comes to the US without a parent or guardian. Increasingly—as lawyers have been reporting, and as the interior secretary who interviewed children in detention last week confirmed—children are coming to the US with a relative who is not their parent, and being separated.

Because the law defines an “unaccompanied” child as someone without a parent or legal guardian here, border agents don’t have the ability to keep a child with a grandparent, aunt or uncle, or even a sibling who’s over 18, though advocates have also raised concerns that border agents are separating relatives even when there is evidence of legal guardianship.

Under the terms of US law—and especially the 1997 Flores settlement, which governs the treatment of children in immigration custody—immigration agents are obligated to get unaccompanied children out of immigration detention as quickly as possible, and to keep them in the highest possible conditions while they’re there. Barring emergencies, children aren’t supposed to be
in Border Patrol custody for more than 72 hours before being sent to HHS—which is responsible for finding and vetting a sponsor to house the child (usually their closest relative or legal guardian).

That hasn’t been happening. Attorneys, doctors, and human rights observers have consistently reported that children are being held for medically dangerous and even life-threatening amounts of time before being picked up by HHS. And in the meantime, they’re being kept in facilities that weren’t built to hold even adults for that long, in facilities designed for something different—"asylum facilities" that look like (and are commonly referred to as) tents.

The Trump administration absolutely, totally, definitely doesn’t just affect children. But conditions for children are under special legal scrutiny.

Since late last year, US immigration agents have been overwhelmed by the number of children crossing the border. The US immigration system, which was built to quickly arrest and deport single Mexican adults entering the US to work, doesn’t have the capacity to deal with tens of thousands of children (mostly from Central America) who are often seeking asylum in the US.

The length of time migrants are spending in Border Patrol custody (and the conditions there) has attracted some alarm before. In April, lawyers for children being held outside a bridge in El Paso, fenced in and sleeping on the ground, attracted outrage and led Border Patrol to stop holding migrants in that way. But the DHS spokesperson for the Inspector General released an emergency report about dangerous overcrowding of adults in two facilities: with up to 900 people being held a single facility designed to hold 100 people.

Because of the Flores settlement, lawyers have the opportunity to investigate conditions at the facilities if the government is complying—and possibly ask a judge to intervene if it is not. That’s what spurred the fact-finding mission that led to last week’s stories.

The reports about Clint broke at a time when the Trump administration was already playing defense about its compliance with the Flores settlement. (While the administration is working on a regulation that would supersede the terms of the agreement, that regulation isn’t expected to be published until fall, and may well be held up in court.)

In a 9th Circuit Court of Appeals hearing earlier last week about whether the administration is complying with its obligation to monitor conditions for children in ICE and CBP custody, a Department of Justice lawyer denied that children didn’t necessarily need toothbrushes or toothbrushes to be in "safe and sanitary" conditions—a clip that looked especially bad when the Clint stories came out showing the children were denied just that.

The court hearing was not specifically about the Clint facility—it wasn’t about what happened last week, and wasn’t even about Clint. And as Ken White explained for the Atlantic, Fabien’s cringeworthy "safe and sanitary" argument came from the awkward stance the Trump administration has taken in this litigation: In order to challenge the court appointment of a special monitor, they argued that there’s a difference between a promise to keep kids safe and healthy, or has been unable to keep it—or a mix of both.

The problem isn’t Clint. The problems that investigators identified at Clint—too many people, not enough food, no toothbrushes—weren’t inherent to that specific facility, but a trend of violations of an overload (or neglected) system.

And it’s already clear that those problems go beyond Clint. Aircare Newmann, the chief of a doctor who visited another facility for children in Texas—the Ursula facility—and witnessed conditions that were "extreme" when he arrived on 24 hours a day, no adequate access to medical care, basic sanitation, water, or adequate food.” She said the conditions were so bad that they were "profoundly, intentionally causing the spread of disease."

The children are now being sent from Clint to a facility that is just as bad, according to Clara Long, who was the only member of last week’s investigative team who visited it.

Long told Vox that when she was there, the facility in El Paso known as "Border Patrol Station 1" was mostly being used as a transit center where migrants were staying only a few hours before going elsewhere. But in the facility, she said, she was held in a cell there for six days, and who voiced the same concerns that children in the Clint facility did.

The mother of the family, Long said, was so ashamed of not having clean teeth—the El Paso facility, like Clint, wasn’t providing enough toothbrushes—that "when she was talking her teeth were hanging in front of her mouth and wouldn’t take it down." The teenager son said he was afraid of the guards because when he’d gotten up to go to the bathroom, a guard would stand up in front of his mouth and wouldn’t take it down. The teen also said that when he looked down, a guard had shoved him back into his cell and slammed the door on him. For two nights, he said, the family had to sleep on the cold floor with blankets they didn’t have.

The fundamental question: Why is it taking so long to get kids out of custody—and is it happening on purpose?

Most of the children who were at Clint when the team visited last week—about 25% of the 350—were set to be sent to HHS custody by Tuesday.

Questions remain about what is happening to the other 1,750 or so children who were in Border Patrol detention on Thursday if levy the situation to last week, and why the government was able to place only 250 children over five days with the agency that’s supposed to take responsibility for all children with parents in the US.

It’s not clear where the bureaucratic breakdown really is—and whether it’s the result of resource constraints or choices about how resources are used.

The Trump administration definitely has made a choice to keep single adults in detention, even if it could release them. Border Patrol chief Carla Provost has told Congress that "if we lose (the ability to keep and deport) adults in two facilities: with up to 900 people being held a single facility designed to hold 100 people.

But to some progressives, led in Congress by Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, spending any money to immigration enforcement agencies right now is an endorsement of the current state of affairs. And so a one-more-dime camp, in part, is taking a bright-line stance against the detention of children. But in part, they’re demonstrating a lack of trust in the administration to adhere to any law or condition. And they assume that any money given to ICE for transit of migrant kids will, in some way or another, encourage ICE to detain more families and arrest more immigrants in the United States.

The "smart money" camp, on the other hand, believes firmly that the only way to improve conditions in detention, the conditions will only get worse.

What’s especially regrettable is that case of kids deemed “unaccompanied,” who have to remain in custody until a sponsor is found. The past few days have demonstrated that these children are excruciatingly vulnerable and that much of the American public wants their situation to change. It just may not be clear how.

[From Time, June 20, 2019]

LAWYERS SAY MIGRANT CHILDREN ARE LIVING IN ‘TRAUMATIC AND DANGEROUS’ CONDITIONS AT U.S.-MEXICO BORDER

BY CEDAR ATTAANASIO, GARANCE BURKE AND MARTHA MENDOZA

CLINT, TEXAS.—In a tiny Texas town about a half-hour drive from El Paso, a nondescript Border Patrol station operated for six years primarily as a hub for agents on patrol, drawing little scrutiny from immigration attorneys who have been loudly advocating against mass U.S. detention camps that can hold more than 2,000 teens at a time.

And so attorneys visiting the Border Patrol station in Clint, Texas, said they were shocked to find more than 250 infants, children and teens inside the complex of windowless buildings, trying to care for them with what they described as inadequate food, water and sanitation. “This facility wasn’t even on our radar before we
came down here," said law professor Warren Binford, a member of the team that has interviewed 60 detainees in Clint.

Binford’s group warned that because Customs and Border Protection facilities are overwhelmed with migrants, they feared similar situations could be unfolding elsewhere.

Attorney Toby Gialluca, who visited teens and their babies last week in a McAllen, Texas, Border Patrol station, said everyone she interviewed was very sick with high fevers, and wearing soiled clothes crusted with mucus and dirt after their long trip north. Fifteen kids at Clint had the flu, another 20 were infected with the respiratory sickness. Everyone. They’re using their clothes to wipe mucous off the children, vomit off the children. Most of the little children are not fed, she said.

Migrant teens in McAllen told her they were offered frozen ham sandwiches and rotten food, Gialluca said. In both stations, the children told attorneys that guards instructed girls as young as age 8 to care for the babies and toddlers.

Border Patrol stations are designed to hold people for three days, but some children held in Clint and McAllen have been there for weeks. Legally, migrants under 18 should be moved into Office of Refugee Resettlement facilities within 72 hours.

But federal officials have said they have hit a breaking point, with too many migrant children and nowhere to put them. That’s in part because over the last year, migrant children have been staying longer in federal custody than they had historically, meaning there are fewer shelter beds in the separate Office of Refugee Resettlement stations.

McAllen and Clint stations are designed to hold girls as young as age 8 to care for other children. Migrant teens in McAllen told her they were offered frozen ham sandwiches and rotten food, Gialluca said.

In an interview earlier this week with The Associated Press, Customs and Border Protection John Sanders acknowledged that children died after being in the agency’s care, and said Border Patrol stations are currently holding 15,000 people—more than three times their maximum capacity of 4,000.

He urged Congress to pass a $16.6 billion emergency funding package includes nearly $3 billion to care for unaccompanied migrant children.

A migrant father, speaking on condition of anonymity because of his immigration status, said he did not know where his 15-year-old daughter was until one of the attorneys visiting Cl Clint this week found his phone number written in permanent marker on a bracelet the girl was wearing. She suffered “because she’s never been alone. She doesn’t know these other children,” her father said.

Republican Congressman Will Hurd, whose district includes Cl Clint, said “tragic conditions” playing out on the southern border were pushing government agencies, nonprofits and Texas communities to the limit.

“This latest development just further demonstrates the immediate need to reform asylum laws and provide supplemental funding to address the humanitarian crisis at our border,” he said.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, before I yield to our next speaker, I would remind my colleagues that a Liberal vote is a No vote. It’s really not a vote to bring up the Senate bill. It is a vote to give control of the House floor to the Republicans.

They say they would bring up the Senate bill, but there is absolutely no guarantee that they would. They could bring up a bill to fund a wall, for all we know.

Madam Speaker, we are here to find a way to alleviate the suffering of these children at our border and not to play political games. We said urge my colleagues to make sure that they vote “yes” on the previous question.

And, by the way, I just say to my colleague from Oklahoma, a lot of us aren’t satisfied with the Senate bill the way it has been drafted because there are protections that we want to see in that bill because, quite frankly, speaking for myself, I don’t trust this administration.

I don’t trust this administration to do the right thing, an administration that separated—knowingly and deliberately separated—children from their parents at the border, an administration that tolerated the conditions that have horrified the entire country.

So I want it clear that the money that we are appropriating are going to help children, not to continue this insane inhumane policy that has horrified this Nation.

I won’t trust this administration to tell me the correct time, at this particular point. So, no, we are not satisfied. We want more protections in here for the children. We want more transparency. The American people, I think, expect that. We should provide them that information.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), the distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

Yes, indeed, we have a responsibility to act. As Speaker PELOSI has said, we must do this for the sake of the children, and I thank her for not capitulating to the Senate demands for a blank check.

When I reflect on the number of deaths that we have seen at the border, when I reflect on the horrific conditions in facilities where children are being held in ice-cold cells with no one to care for them but a child stranger—conditions in these facilities are horrific—I ask myself: Is this the America that I came to as a young child? Is this the America that my mother and father fought to protect when they joined the U.S. Air Force? This surely isn’t the country that welcomed me as a young child from Guatemala.

But we must work toward that American ideal that we all share. We cannot simply allocate funds to agencies where we have seen numerous children die in their custody.

No blank checks.

No more torturing of babies.

No more separating infants from their mothers.

This legislation brings funds to the children that are urgently needed.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my very good friend and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, well, here we are again, and I talked on this before.

I am from the State of Arizona, so border security is top and center of the discussion in Arizona and it has, quite frankly, been for years.

We have all known there has been a crisis at our border for many, many years, and that is why I am at least hopeful and inspired a little bit that my Democratic colleagues are actually admitting—finally—that there is a crisis at our border. So that is good.

The thing that is bad about this rule today is that I just don’t understand. I guess some of my Democratic colleagues are just being stubborn because, on the one hand, you have the Senate that already passed an overwhemingly bipartisan bill, where Senator SCHUMER voted for it. You have a President who said we are not in favor of this House version of the Senate bill.

Mr. SCHUMER, the President, who, seemingly, is willing to sign the Senate bill; you have a Senate bill that has vast bipartisan support, even with the
Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, many of the children have families living right here in the United States that they could be reunited with. But those who are running the facilities have no incentive for reuniting them.

The Senate bill does not have a timeline. The Senate bill is inadequate. We must pass the House-amended bill.

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

I know my friends are aware of this, but the Senate bill is actually—well, I certainly would vote for it. I think it would have overwhelming support on our side. The President, in the past, has expressed some concerns, and that is an important thing, but the Senate has really worked through a lot of these differences.

The bill that we would like to see put on this floor and that we know would pass with overwhelming bipartisan support is a product of compromise, so much compromise that the entire Democratic leadership felt comfortable voting for it.

With all due respect to my friends, their bill is not the product of compromise. It is not going to get very many Republican votes here, if any. I would be surprised, frankly, if it did. It is not likely to get accepted by the United States Senate. It absolutely won't be signed by the President of the United States.

We are all concerned about the conditions. We have been expressing that concern for 8 weeks. We never called this a manufactured crisis. We never said that this was made up for political purposes. The administration recognized it 8 weeks ago.

We have tried multiple times to get this House to focus on it. I am very pleased that we finally reached a point that both sides are focusing on it. But we also ought to focus on what is possible to achieve in a limited timeframe.

We know we are running out of time. We know there are real-life consequences to that. They are starting to unfold right now. There are services being cut back. For a lot of these conditions, frankly, we ought to look in the mirror, as Congress, and ask why we did not do these resources there a long time ago.

Frankly, the House rule that we are discussing on the House bill, that bill actually reduces resources at the border. It doesn't expand them. It reduces them. It reduces them also for the American military. That is part of it.

The Senate bill, in my view, frankly, is much superior to my friends' product, but it has one virtue above all: All of the Senate bill is put on the floor and pass it, and it goes to the President of the United States to be signed immediately. Resources begin to move to where they are desperately needed immediately.

That is not true with my friends' bill. All it does is reopen the dialogue with the Senate, where it has very little prospect of passing. Then, frankly, if it did pass—not likely—it would be vetoed.

I am befuddled, Madam Speaker, that they are pursuing a goal that they know will not work, but we have seen this time and time again. It is more important to get a bill across the floor in a partisan fashion than it is to put something on the floor that is bipartisan, that can pass the Senate and come into law.

Now, my friends know we live in an era of divided government, and we have wasted 6 months, in my view, dealing with a lot of this. If we knew we would never pass, but I respect my friends' right to bring their agenda to the floor.

This is different. This is a national emergency. It has to pass. We have one place where it can be passed and be signed so that help can go immediately. We have my friends' vehicle, which I know they believe in passionately, and I respect that, but it can't pass.

It is pretty simple. Sooner or later, I hope we get to the obvious answer and pass the Senate bill and send it to the President.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I take offense to my colleague from Arizona saying we are not going to win. This is not a game. These are people's lives.

When my colleague says we need to try, we have tried. I am asking them to try harder because we are creating a whole generation of children, Mr. MCGOVERN, who will remember what we did when we enraged them up like animals. We ripped them away from their parents and pumped them with drugs to make them stop crying for their mothers.

No amount of apologizing and no amount of debating in this Chamber will make it better. Madam Speaker, I am asking my colleagues to be more humane, to debate real policy change that will address the crisis at the border, like comprehensive immigration reform.

We must do better for these children. Again, no amount of apologizing, no amount of debating, no amount of politicking will make it better.
Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will just make the same point I have been making for days on end. We have something that can pass versus something that can’t. I don’t doubt for a minute that my friends are sincere in their concerns, but I also respect colleagues on the other side of the rostrum in the United States Senate. I think they are sincere, too. They have worked through and found a way to go forward that got 84 votes. Three-quarters of the Democratic minority in the Senate voted for it. The entire Democratic leadership voted for it. The President has signaled that he will sign it.

We can continue the debates on some of these other things at a later point. My friends might want to come back with another piece of legislation addressing some of their concerns that they think are not appropriately addressed in the Senate bill. But the reality is that bill that can pass, and it would go to the President.

We can continue to have this debate. We can even end it, launch some vehicle over to the Senate, and waste more time. That is all it will be, a waste of time.

I would hope we all have had our say. We all feel strongly about our points, and we can continue to have this debate. We can even end it, launch some vehicle over to the Senate, and waste more time. That is all it will be, a waste of time.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I yield the bal-
ance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the gentleman from Oklahoma, but I am an optimist.

More importantly, I stand here in the name of Mr. Ramirez and his little, baby girl who were found on the shores of the Rio Grande. The question is: How did they wind up there? They wound up there because of this administration’s policies that rejected them as there stood on the Brownsville-Mata-
rinos International Bridge.

There was no reason to say the bridge was closed. They had a legal right to claim asylum, fleeing from the horrible violence of El Salvador. Yet, they could not stand there, and so this is their end.

I am supporting this bill because I believe we should not settle for just anything. This bill particularly provides for the requirements that have been raised by the House. I also respect colleagues on the other side of the rostrum so that they don’t die, so that they do have toothpaste, that they are clean, that they are living in clean places. It acknowledges that children cannot be held like cattle in one place beyond 90 days, that you must find their family members, and, yes, there are family members.

This is a process that has been the law of the land for decades. It is an asylum that can address it. It takes no one’s place. It does nothing to hurt this Nation.

I support the underlying legislation because, in the name of Mr. Ramirez and his child, we must do what is right.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I personally thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), for the professional and very patient manner in which she handled the Chair and presided over this body. I wanted to recognize that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), my very good friend.

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I, too, want to recognize my colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for having the coolest scarf in the House today, the American flag.

Bipartisanship has broken out in the Senate. They passed H.R. 3401, as amended, 84–8.

I am now happy to report to the House that bipartisanship has broken out on the floor of the House of Representa-
tives, for I am announcing that 23 Democrats and 20 Republicans from the Problem Solvers Caucus have just issued the following statement: “Given the humanitarian crisis at the border, the Problem Solvers Caucus is asking for the immediate consideration on the House floor today of H.R. 3401, as amended by the Senate.”

We are certain that H.R. 3401 will pass. I ask us to let the bipartisanship spread to the rest of this House and put an end to this now, once and for all, and get the help to the border that is so needed.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I have the honor and privilege to be born as an American citizen. There are billions of people around the world who don’t have that privilege, that honor, and that blessing.

Today, I get to exercise my privilege as a Member of Congress to bring my two grandchildren, ages 1 and 3, to the floor of the House of Representatives. It is a very emotional moment for me because when I see their beautiful brown eyes, I see their grandparents who were born in another country, and I see their great-grandparents born in another country, just like many people on this House floor whose grandparents and great-grandparents came from Germany, Guatemala, Mexico, or any other place on the planet.

We are fighting to do what is right, to do what is right for the gold standard that the world has seen in the United States of America, a place of hope and a place of future for people who are fleeing persecution for religious reasons or otherwise to be able to come to this country, kiss the ground that they walk on, and start anew.

My beautiful grandkids get to be American citizens because somebody made the journey sometime before them.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I close by saying this: The United States of America has always been the gold standard, and that is the argument that we are making here today.

This is not a game. We are fighting for the lives of human beings who should have the opportunity to be just like every person on this floor: to be allowed the freedom to be who they choose to be, who God made them to be, by being in the greatest place on the planet. That is why we are fighting today.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), who is my good friend.

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have a crisis on our southern border, and H.R. 3401 with the Senate amend-
ments gets resources to give humani-
tarian assistance to those seeking asy-
lu.

It also adds judges and judge teams to hear the claims of asylum. Many people have to wait up to 3 years to get their hearing. That is too long. I have twice in the last 2 weeks attempted to offer an amendment to add judge teams. Both times, the Rules Committee has failed to include it.

My amendment this week would have included the amount that was in the Senate bill, but it is now in the bill because we have the Senate bill sitting at the Speaker’s desk.

I urge my colleagues to take up the bill with the Senate amendments that include judge teams. That is the only way to solve this real crisis: adjudicate the claims of these people who want asylum, reunite families, and stop people from being held in detention as long.

Mr. GONZALEZ from Texas and I have worked together on this. It is a bipartisanship effort. This is a no-brainer. We need to add judges. The Senate bill does that.

Madam Speaker, I hope we can take up the Senate bill and make it happen.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge opposition to this rule. Once again, the majority is making the exact same mistake it made earlier this week. We have a bipartisan bill already approved by the Senate. The House should simply take it up and work its will on that bill.

Frankly, we all know, if that bill were to come to the floor, it would pass overwhelmingly with a majority of each side voting in favor of it. Then it wouldn’t have to go back to the Senate. It would go immediately to the President of the United States. He could sign it, and these resources would begin to flow.

Now, again, we have had a robust debate today, and I respect the passions on both sides and every point of view about this. Actually, I see a great deal of common agreement. We agree, which we did not 8 weeks ago, that there is an emergency on the southern border. We agree it is a humanitarian crisis. We agree there need to be resources that go there immediately. We agree that time is short.

We are also all elected officials who are privileged to be in this Chamber, and my experience with my friends on both sides of the aisle is that they are basically pretty practical people. They came here to solve problems. They have different viewpoints, but they are almost always very practical and try to get something done.

We know the Senate bill is not everything that my side would want. We certainly know it is not everything that my friend’s side would want. But we know it is bipartisan. We know three-quarters of the Democrats in the other Chamber voted for it. We know it will pass.

With all due respect to my friends, they have clung so tightly to their bill, which I know they believe in. It will pass here, but it won’t pass the Senate, and it certainly won’t be signed by the President.

Where will we be if we continue down the road that they are laying out in front of us?

I know they are sincerely concerned about children on the border, but we are better off with a bill that passes so we have billions of dollars moving to where they are supposed to go, and a bill, by the way, that the entire Democratic leadership thought was appropriate, good enough.

Let’s not sit here and make the perfect the enemy of the good. Let’s be practical and deliver to the American people what they want, which is a solution, a solution that both parties will vote for and a solution that the President will sign.

How many times do we go home and hear that from our own constituents: Can’t you guys get together and do anything? Can’t you work together? Can’t you put aside your differences and put the American people first?

It pains me as a House Member to admit it, I suppose, but the United States Senate did that in this case before we did. We can accept that and move on, and my friends can continue to fight for the things they believe. It is not as if, for these things that are in this bill that the administration won’t accept, they can’t wrap them up again and put them back in another bill and start the process.

If we do not act, the resources will not get to the border where they are needed, and these conditions that concern us all will continue.

I urge us to step back a little bit, accept that in this case the Senate has a bipartisan solution that will work, and for goodness’ sake, just put it on the floor to see what happens.

We know what will happen. My friends will vote for it in overwhelming numbers. My friends on my side of the aisle will vote for it in overwhelming numbers. It will go straight to the President of the United States.

That isn’t going to solve the problem, but it is going to ease the problem, and that is going to move us in the right direction and provide our very hard-pressed people—who are working this problem by caring for the migrants, trying to protect our borders, and trying to provide justice—the resources they need to continue to work on this problem while, frankly, we continue to try to arrive at a legislative solution.

Madam Speaker, I want to end with a point I made just a little bit earlier. I thank the Chair for the patient and professional manner in which she has allowed us to conduct this debate. I thank her very much for making sure that when we had an outside disturbance, it was quickly dealt with.

I urge my friends to reconsider and, hopefully, come together around a bill that neither of us thinks is perfect but both of us could probably vote for and the President could sign.

Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for his participation in debate. It is always helpful and always enlightening. He is a good friend and a person I admire a great deal, even when we differ on a particular issue.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I think what is so frustrating to so many of us is that there is controversy surrounding how we can guarantee the protection of these children. The reason we think that is important is because this administration has ignored all the warnings.

We have had whistleblowers talk about the abuse at the border and how these children were being mistreated, and they did nothing.

This administration oversaw a policy of literally tearing children away from their parents. As a dad, I can’t imagine what that must be like for any of those parents and how this administration thought it was fine.

We have a crisis at the border largely as a result of this President’s policies. We need to deal with it, and we need to deal with it now. But we want to make sure we are actually dealing with the crisis and not giving him more money to create other crises.

I appreciate what the gentleman from Oklahoma said about the need for us to continue to work together, and while these negotiations are continuing.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 866. An act to provide a lactation room in public buildings.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is required:

S. 528. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide a lactation room in public buildings, and for other purposes.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1530

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Cárdenas) at 3 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3401. EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SECURITY AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER ACT, 2019

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 466 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 466

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–21. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be
The Speaker pro tempore. The gentle-
man from Massachusetts is recog-
nized for 1 hour.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the cus-
tomyary 30 minutes to the gentle-
man from Oklahoma (Mr. Cole), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consid-
eration of this resolution, all time yield-
ed is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I know we have a common objective here.

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

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
as they have tried to build a better life for themselves, only to find that they are demonized and locked out of the promise that those of us who are natural born citizens are so fortunate to enjoy.

In their name, let us never forget their sacrifice and the sacrifice that so many parents make for the most vulnerable among us.

SECURING AMERICA’S FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2722) 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, will now resume.

The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am not able to support his motion.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in the bill we are debating today and voting on today before the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 72, insert after line 3 the following new section:

```plaintext
following new section:
```

SECURING AMERICA’S FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2722 to the Committee on House Administration with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 72, insert after line 3 the following (and conform the succeeding provisions accordingly):

```

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am not able to support his motion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit.

For months, we have heard about the interference in our elections and the report of Special Counsel Robert Mueller, this report right here. But nothing in this bill that we are debating today and voting on today before this body now addresses the concerns that have been raised in this report.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in the bill we are debating today addresses the concerns of foreign interference raised in the special counsel's report that I am holding right now. What we know is that Russia attempted to interfere in our 2016 election through a misinformation campaign, email hacking, and by exploiting vulnerabilities of registration databases. This is gravely concerning to every Republican and Democrat in this institution.

But what does the Federal Government telling States that they must replace their safe, new, and auditable machines have to do with addressing these concerns? What does a hand recount mandate have to do with these concerns? What does recycled paper count mandate have to do with these concerns?

The tremendous costs associated with these Federal mandates only serve to draw resources away from the real vulnerabilities our States face.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have also represented that Republicans have done nothing to address foreign interference in our elections, and that, Mr. Speaker, is simply not true.
In 2017, this country’s election infrastructure was designated as critical infrastructure, thereby allowing the Department of Homeland Security to immediately begin offering voluntary assistance to State and local election officials in the form of cybersecurity advisories, threat detection and prevention tools, information sharing, and incident response.

Additionally, the 115th Congress, last Congress, a Republican-controlled Congress, appropriated $300 million to States prior to the 2018 midterm to bolster election security and $26 million to DHS to add additional staff and carry out their assessment efforts, allowing for unprecedented cooperation between DHS and all 50 States and 1,400 localities in 2018.

Earlier this year, $33 million was appropriated to DHS to continue these assistance efforts, and earlier this week, the Republicans, my fellow Republicans, Mr. WALKER and Mr. LOUDENBERRY, to the House Administration Committee, introduced our own Election Security Assistance Act.

So don’t tell me we are not taking this seriously.

While so much of the focus has been on foreign interference today, we must not forget that we had a Member not seated this Congress following evidence that political operatives illegally harvested unsealed and only partially filled-out ballots. This practice is legal in many States, but as we have seen, it is ripe for fraud and abuse.

Republicans have offered multiple amendments to prohibit this practice in H.R. 1 and, now, the SAFE Act, each failing on a party-line vote. If we can’t agree that this fraudulent practice should be banned, let us at least agree that foreign nationals should not be harvesting the ballots of American citizens.

Right now, a Russian operative could walk freely around States like California, for example, collecting and turning in absentee ballots, completely altering the outcome of an election. But my colleagues have shown no interest in addressing this huge vulnerability simply because it serves their interest only in certain States.

This practice invites a constitutional crisis. America, Mr. Speaker, is watching this vote right now. My amendment today would require the chief election officials in each State to disclose to the Election Assistance Commission the identity of any known foreign national who has physically handled ballots, machines, or has had unmonitored access to the storage facilities or tabulation centers used to support elections, or even unmonitored access to election-related information or communication technology. This requires an additional step in rooting out foreign interference and lets the process of legislating about election security finally begin.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit. Vote to protect our elections from interference from foreign countries like Russia, China, and all others. Vote to preserve the integrity of our ballot, and vote to restore the American people’s trust in our institutions.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

In our democracy, we should actively be seeking ways to involve more people rather than shutting them out of the process. Some States have done this by making voting accessible for home-bound voters and others who have trouble physically getting to the polls and allowing an absentee voter to designate anyone of their choosing to drop off a marked ballot. This policy allows for greater participation in elections because some homebound voters have no family or individuals to delegate that role to. They should not be disenfranchised by our laws.

Ballot drop-off laws are, in and of themselves, perfectly appropriate election administration laws. If your aunt or uncle is a physician of an H1B visa holder, if you are working a double shift and you hand your ballot to someone to deliver, if you are married to an individual with TPS status, this would require you to report that individual to the Federal Government.

The House Administration Committee is already reviewing the foreign influence on American elections as the chairwoman mentioned, and we welcome the minority working with us in this regard. We know, from a Washington Post story published earlier this year, in which Members here in this Chamber are quoted as developing a strategy to engage in that practice themselves.

In fact, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle were quoted as being laser focused on ballot collection in the 2020 elections. So they will have to forgive me if I don’t buy into the argument they are making today that their favorite problems with the system are actions of a political operative on behalf of a Republican colleague that illegally changed and threw away ballots.

This is a suppression tactic. It is the height of hypocrisy that our Republican colleagues would be creating a new Federal standard after this entire debate they had been railing against the same. They will forgive us if we feel that that is a little disingenuous. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would close by urging every Member to vote against this motion to recommit and further note that the House Administration Committee will soon be examining foreign influence on our elections. We would welcome the participation of the minority in that important work.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote. A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This will be a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 220, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

AYES—189

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Anne
Babin
Bacon
Baier
Balderson
Baker
Balderson
Banks
Baldor
Baird
Baker
Barr
Bergman
Boustany
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brady (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)

Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
Davis, Steve
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Elat
Eason

Fulcher
Gant
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Goosen
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Bagedash
Harrell
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hernandez

Hartzler
Hickson
Higgins (LA)
Higginson
Hill (AR)
Holden
Holmes
Huizenga
Hunsecker

Hunsecker
Hunt
Huntley
Hurlburt
Hutchison
Hutcheson
King

Ike

Johnson (TX)
Johnson (VA)
Johnson (WI)
Jordan
Jova
Joyce

Joya

Kaptur
Katz

Johnson
Johnson (TX)
Johnson (VA)
Jordan
Jova
Joyce
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Mr. ROY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPAKER pro tempore.** The question is on the passage of the bill.

The Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

| Roll No. 429 |
| AYES—225 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECORDED VOTE**

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The **SPAKER pro tempore.** This vote is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—eyes 225, noes 184, not voting 23, as follows:

| [Roll No. 429] |
| AYES—225 |

|-------|---------|---------|-------|----------|--------|------|-----------|-------|-----|-------------|---------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------|-------|--------|-------|---------|-------------|----------|--------|-------------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|

**NOES—184**

|-------|-------------|-----|---------|-------|-----|------|---------|-------|-----|-------------|---------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------|-------|--------|-------|---------|-------------|----------|--------|-------------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|

**NOT VOTING—23**

|-------|----------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|--------|------|---------|-------|-----|-------------|---------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------|-------|--------|-------|---------|-------------|----------|--------|-------------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SECURIT Y AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER ACT, 2019

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 466, I call up the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment. Senate amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, namely:

T I T L E I
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW

For an additional amount for “Executive Office for Immigration Review”, $65,000,000, of which $45,000,000 shall be for the hiring of 30 additional Immigration Judge Teams, of which $10,000,000 shall be used for the purchase or lease of immigration judge courtroom space and equipment, and of which $10,000,000 shall be used only for services and activities provided by the Legal Orientation Program: Provided, That Immigration Judges shall include appropriate attorneys, law clerks, paralegals, court administrators, and other support staff: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

T I T L E II
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT

For an additional amount for “Operations and Support” necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied minors and family unit aliens at the southwest border and related activities, $2,024,000, for necessary expenses necessary to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied minors and family unit aliens at the southwest border:

SEC. 303. None of the funds provided in this Act under “U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Operations and Support” for facilities that are not available until U.S. Customs and Border Protection establishes policies (via directive, procedures, guidance, and/or memorandum) and training programs to ensure that such facilities are consistent with the Office of Professional Responsibility for background investigations and facility inspections, and $21,286,000 is for Homeland Security Investigations human trafficking investigations: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for “Federal Assistance”, $30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021, for the emergency food and shelter program under title III of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11331 et seq.) for the purposes of providing assistance specifically described under that heading, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall distribute such funds only to jurisdictions or local recipient organizations serving communities that have experienced a significant increase in such alien aliens: Provided further, That such funds may be used to reimburse such jurisdictions or local recipient organizations for costs incurred in providing services to such aliens on or after January 1, 2019: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

S E C T I O N 3 0 3 . None of the funds provided in this Act under “U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Operations and Support” for facilities that are not available until U.S. Customs and Border Protection establishes policies (via directive, procedures, guidance, and/or memorandum) and training programs to ensure that such facilities are consistent with the Office of Professional Responsibility for background investigations and facility inspections, and $21,286,000 is for Homeland Security Investigations human trafficking investigations: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the House Judiciary Committee regarding the establishment and implementation of such policies and training programs.

SEC. 304. No later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a report on the number of Border Patrol agents assigned to northern border land ports of entry and temporarily assigned to the ongoing humanitarian crisis: Provided, That the report shall be provided to the relevant House and Senate Committees and shall include resources and conditions that would allow a return to northern border staffing levels that are no less than the number committed in the June 12, 2018 Department of Homeland Security Border Strategy: Preliminary Finding, and provided further, That the report shall include the number of officers temporarily assigned to the southwest border in response to the ongoing humanitarian crisis, the number of days the officers will be away from their northern border assignment, the northern border ports from which officers are being assigned to the southwest border, and efforts being made to limit the impact on operations at each northern border land port of entry where officers have been temporarily assigned to the southwest border.

SEC. 305. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116–6) for the Department of Homeland Security may be used to relocate to the National Targeting Center the vetting of Trusted Traveler Program applications and operations currently carried out at existing locations unless specifically authorized by a statute enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 306. The personnel, supplies, or equipment of any component of the Department of Homeland Security may be transferred to another component of the Department of Homeland Security or deployed to another Department of Homeland Security activity related to the significant rise in aliens at the southwest border and related activities, and for that purpose the Secretary may make changes to such operational directives as are necessary to prevent unaccompanied alien children from being placed in dangerous or unsuitable facilities.

SEC. 307. None of the funds provided by this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be transferred, realigned, or otherwise used for any purpose under any appropriation heading other than the heading "Refugee and Entrant Assistance" unless provided to the Secretary for costs of leases of property, support of services, or other expenses: Provided further, That not less than $8,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the purposes of hiring additional Federal Field Specialists and for increasing case management and case coordination services, with the goal of more expeditiously placing unaccompanied alien children with sponsors and reducing the length of stay in congregate care, detention, and other alternative care facilities, and for providing case coordination services to unaccompanied alien children in custody.

SEC. 308. No later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Senate and the House of Representatives an assessment, in writing, to the Secretary and to Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of whether such changes to operational directives are necessary to prevent unaccompanied alien children from being placed in danger.

SEC. 404. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading "Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance" may be obligated to a grantee or contractor to house unaccompanied alien children (as such term is defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2))) in any facility that is not State-licensed for the care of unaccompanied alien children, except in the case that the Secretary determines that housing unaccompanied alien children in such a facility is necessary on a temporary basis due to an influx of such children or an emergency, provided that—

(1) the terms of the grant or contract for the operations of such facility that remains in operation for more than six consecutive months shall require compliance with—

(A) the same requirements as licensed facilities, as listed in Exhibit 2 of the Community Protection and Safety Settlement Agreement that the Secretary determines are applicable to non-State licensed facilities; and

(B) staffing ratios of one (1) on-duty Youth Care Worker for every eight (8) children or youth during waking hours, one (1) on-duty Youth Care Worker for every sixteen (16) children or youth during sleeping hours, and appropriate ratios to children (including mental health providers) as required in grantee cooperative agreements;

(2) the Secretary may grant a 60-day waiver for a contractor’s or grantee’s non-compliance with paragraph (1) if the Secretary certifies and provides a report to Congress on the contractor’s or grantee’s good-faith efforts and progress toward compliance;

(3) not more than four consecutive waivers under paragraph (2); and

(4) the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate the outlining the requirements of ORR for influx facilities including any requirement listed in paragraph (1)(A) that the Secretary has determined are not applicable to non-State licensed facilities.

SEC. 405. In addition to the existing Congressional notification for formal site assessments of influx facilities under section 278(f) of the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at least 15 days before operationalizing an unlicensed facility: Provided further, That the Secretary shall provide a written notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 72 hours of conducting a formal assessment of a facility for possible operationalization and within 72 hours of any acquisition or lease of real property: Provided further, That not less than $865,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the purpose of care in licensed shelters and for expanding the supply of shelters for which State licensure will be sought, of which amounts, to the extent practicable, shall be used for the purposes of adding shelter beds in State-licensed facilities in response to funding opportunity HHS–2017–ACF–ORR–ZU–1132, and of which not less than $100,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for post-release services, child advocates, and legal services: Provided further, That not less than $8,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the purposes of hiring additional Federal Field Specialists and for increasing case management and case coordination services, with the goal of more expeditiously placing unaccompanied alien children with sponsors and reducing the length of stay in congregate care, detention, and other alternative care facilities, and for providing case coordination services to unaccompanied alien children in custody.

SEC. 406. None of the funds provided by this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be transferred, realigned, or otherwise used for any purpose under any appropriation heading other than the heading "Refugee and Entrant Assistance" unless provided to the Secretary for costs of leases of property, support of services, or other expenses: Provided further, That not less than $8,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the purposes of hiring additional Federal Field Specialists and for increasing case management and case coordination services, with the goal of more expeditiously placing unaccompanied alien children with sponsors and reducing the length of stay in congregate care, detention, and other alternative care facilities, and for providing case coordination services to unaccompanied alien children in custody.

SEC. 407. The personnel, supplies, or equipment of any component of the Department of Homeland Security may be transferred to another component of the Department of Homeland Security or deployed to another Department of Homeland Security activity related to the significant rise in aliens at the southwest border and related activities, and for that purpose the Secretary may make changes to such operational directives as are necessary to prevent unaccompanied alien children from being placed in dangerous or unsuitable facilities.

SEC. 408. No later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Senate and the House of Representatives an assessment, in writing, to the Secretary and to Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of whether such changes to operational directives are necessary to prevent unaccompanied alien children from being placed in danger.

SEC. 409. None of the funds provided by this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be transferred, realigned, or otherwise used for any purpose under any appropriation heading other than the heading "Refugee and Entrant Assistance" unless provided to the Secretary for costs of leases of property, support of services, or other expenses: Provided further, That not less than $8,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the purpose of care in licensed shelters and for expanding the supply of shelters for which State licensure will be sought, of which amounts, to the extent practicable, shall be used for the purposes of adding shelter beds in State-licensed facilities in response to funding opportunity HHS–2017–ACF–ORR–ZU–1132, and of which not less than $100,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for post-release services, child advocates, and legal services: Provided further, That not less than $8,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the purposes of hiring additional Federal Field Specialists and for increasing case management and case coordination services, with the goal of more expeditiously placing unaccompanied alien children with sponsors and reducing the length of stay in congregate care, detention, and other alternative care facilities, and for providing case coordination services to unaccompanied alien children in custody.

SEC. 410. The Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 72 hours of conducting a formal assessment of a facility for possible operationalization and within 72 hours of any acquisition or lease of real property: Provided further, That not less than $865,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the purpose of care in licensed shelters and for expanding the supply of shelters for which State licensure will be sought, of which amounts, to the extent practicable, shall be used for the purposes of adding shelter beds in State-licensed facilities in response to funding opportunity HHS–2017–ACF–ORR–ZU–1132, and of which not less than $100,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for post-release services, child advocates, and legal services: Provided further, That not less than $8,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the purposes of hiring additional Federal Field Specialists and for increasing case management and case coordination services, with the goal of more expeditiously placing unaccompanied alien children with sponsors and reducing the length of stay in congregate care, detention, and other alternative care facilities, and for providing case coordination services to unaccompanied alien children in custody.

SEC. 411. The personnel, supplies, or equipment of any component of the Department of Homeland Security may be transferred to another component of the Department of Homeland Security or deployed to another Department of Homeland Security activity related to the significant rise in aliens at the southwest border and related activities, and for that purpose the Secretary may make changes to such operational directives as are necessary to prevent unaccompanied alien children from being placed in dangerous or unsuitable facilities.

SEC. 412. No later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Senate and the House of Representatives an assessment, in writing, to the Secretary and to Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of whether such changes to operational directives are necessary to prevent unaccompanied alien children from being placed in danger.
children at the facility, and, for any child that has been at the facility for more than 60 days, their length of stay and reason for delay in release.

SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary shall ensure that, when feasible, no unaccompanied alien child is at an unlicensed facility if the child—
(1) is not expected to be placed with a sponsor within 45 days;
(2) is under the age of 13;
(3) does not speak English or Spanish as his or her preferred language;
(4) has known special needs, behavioral health issues, or medical issues that would be better served at an alternative facility;
(5) is pregnant or giving birth;
(6) would have a diminution of legal services as a result of the transfer to such an unlicensed facility.

(b) ORR shall notify a child’s attorney of record in advance of any transfer, where applicable.

SEC. 407. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to prevent a United States Senator or Member of the House of Representatives from entering, for the purpose of conducting oversight, any facility in the United States used for the purpose of maintaining custody of, or otherwise housing, unaccompanied alien children (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2)), provided that such Senator or Member has coordinated the oversight visit with the Office of Refugee Resettlement not less than two business days in advance to ensure that such visit would not interfere with the operations (including child welfare and child safety operations) of such facility.

SEC. 408. Not later than 14 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and monthly thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the number of asylum officers and immigration judges, including temporary immigration judges, and the corresponding number of support staff necessary—
(1) to fairly and effectively make credible fear determinations with respect to individuals within family units and unaccompanied alien children; and
(2) to ensure that the credible fear determination and asylum interview is completed not later than 20 days after the date on which a family unit is apprehended. And make available online, a report with respect to children who were separated from their parents or legal guardians by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (regardless of whether or not such separation was pursuant to an option selected by the children, parents, or guardians), subsequently classified as unaccompanied alien children, and transferred to the care and custody of ORR during the previous month. Each report shall contain the following information:—
(1) the number and ages of children so separated;
(2) the length of time the children have been with ORR;
(3) the number of families for whom ORR does not have contact information; and
(4) the date and circumstances of separation, as reported by DHS when each child was referred.

SEC. 409. Funds made available in this Act under the heading “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance” shall be subject to the authorities and conditions of section 224 of division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116–6).

SEC. 410. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed sped plan of anticipated uses of funds made available in this account, including the following—a list of existing grants and contracts for both permanent and influx facilities, including their costs, capacity, and timelines; costs for expanding capacity through the use of community-based care arrangements between public and private entities; the number of new or modified grants and contracts; and current and planned efforts to expand new and existing facilities and influx and outreach programs; grants and contracts for child welfare providers; and grants and contracts for child advocates, and post release services; program administration; and the average number of weekly referrals and discharge rate assumed in the spend plan: Provided, That such plan shall be updated to reflect changes and expenditures and submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate every 60 days until all funds are expended or expired.

TITLE V
GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT
SEC. 501. Each amount appropriated or made available by this Act to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2019.

SEC. 504. Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available (or reseeded or transferred, if applicable) only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

SEC. 505. Any amount appropriated by this Act designated as the Conservation emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and subsequently so designated by the President, and transferred pursuant to transfer authorities provided by this Act shall remain available for or reseeded or transferred, if applicable, only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

SEC. 506. Not later than 180 days after the date that an amount is appropriated by this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the number of asylum officers and immigration judges, including temporary immigration judges, and the corresponding number of support staff necessary—
(1) to fairly and effectively make credible fear determinations with respect to individuals within family units and unaccompanied alien children; and
(2) to ensure that the credible fear determination and asylum interview is completed not later than 20 days after the date on which a family unit is apprehended.

This Act may be cited as the “Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019.”

MOTION TO CONCUR
Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows: Mrs. Lowey moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3401.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the motion currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Mrs. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairwoman for yielding and admire her for her distinguished and hard work to bring a solution to the floor. This is not the one that we had hoped for, but it is one that we will be voting on today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank NITA LOWEY, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, Congresswoman ROSA DE LAURO, and all of our appropriations for their relentless good faith work on a strong bill that we had hoped would completely protect vulnerable children, keep America safe, and honor our values.

Today, sadly, and almost with a broken heart, those values are being undermined by failed policies which have intensified a situation of heartbreak and horror on the border, all of which challenges the conscience of America.

I will be brief in just saying, right now, children need their families. Right now, little children are enduring trauma and terror; many are living in squalor at the border station, patrol station; some are sleeping on the cold ground without warm blankets or hot meals.

Kids as young as 7 and 8 years old are watching over infants because no one else is there to care for them. As one little girl caring for two infants said: I need comfort, too. I am bigger than they are, but I am a child, too.

Mr. Speaker, we could have done so much better—so much better—than what we are faced with today. It is my belief, my colleagues, that our country is at a moment of truth in acting upon our values as we did with the Appropriators.

I am proud of the work that our appropriators in the House have done in passing a bill that received overwhelming Democratic support on Tuesday. It was even bipartisan.

The current situation on the border is shameful and does not reflect America’s values. We don’t need anyone—especially the United States Senate—to tell us what the needs are on the border and that we have to act expeditiously.

Our Members are very well versed and excellent representatives of the regions they represent and that are affected, but we want to find a path to
improve the conditions under which we are addressing and ministering to the needs of children and families there.

We are gravely disappointed in the actions taken by the Senate in opposing the regular order of the Congress of the United States. We will continue to fight for our values and priorities in our legislation and beyond.

Our strongest ally in getting a better policy than that which was passed by the Republican Senate is public opinion. Many people and institutions of good faith in our country, our faith-based institutions who minister to the needs of our immigrants, know that this is not the best way to go. So as we go forward, we will continue to fight for our values with public opinion and faith-based organizations on our side.

The American people are constantly asking the question: Why aren’t we doing a better job to respect the dignity and worth of our children? The dignity and worth of our children. The dignify and worth of our children? That might amuse you, but it is not amusing to the children who are affected.

The children come first. At the end of the day, we have to make sure that the resources needed to protect the children are available. Therefore, we will not engage in the same disrespectful behavior that the Senate did in ignoring the House priorities.

In order to get resources to the children fastest, we will reluctantly put the Senate bill on the floor. As the Senate bill passes—when it does—it will not be the end of this debate. It will be the battle cry as to how we go forward to protect children in a way that truly honors their dignity and worth, their spark of divinity that they are all children of God.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR), our colleague, for her beautiful moment of silence that she held earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their leadership to protect values, honor our values, keep America safe. As always, with every vote, it is a vote of conscience.

The situation at the border is a challenge to the conscience of America. It should be a challenge to the conscience of each and one of us. As always, you must vote your conscience.

Mr. Speaker, the humanitarian situation at our southern border is disgraceful. The Trump administration has exacerbated a crisis that has led to intolerable conditions for children and families in the government’s care.

We have been advised that agencies that provide critical services for children, including the Office of Refugee Resettlement and Customs and Border Protection, will imminent run out of funds.

Earlier this week, the House passed a comprehensive bill to fund these agencies and provide important reforms to ensure that children in our government’s care are safe, healthy, and comfortable.

Sadly, the White House, which has done so much to create this crisis, refused to work with us to protect the children; and the Senate majority leader, who I am told is selling T-shirts that depict the Grim Reaper, refuses to respect the House as a co-equal body of Congress and negotiate the differences in our legislation.

Left in the lurch by this cruelty and callousness are the babies and children in government care. The Trump administration refuses to be a party to this cruelty. That is why we are reluctantly bringing the Senate legislation to the floor today.

We could have done better for our children and our families, but, unfortunately, the White House and the Senate would not allow that. So we will fight another day, and we will never stop fighting to protect the children who are our future.

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

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

I rise in very strong support of H.R. 3010, as amended by the Senate. Hundreds of thousands of people have arrived at our border in the last year. More than 100,000 have crossed each of the last 3 months, with 144,000 in May alone. Some of these people are coming through points of entry, but the overwhelming majority are walking through the desert or swimming the Rio Grande.

Men and women across agencies and departments have been working together—and day trying to respond to the overwhelming surge, and they desperately need resources to cover the growing costs. This is a real crisis, and this bill provides funds for all those who are representing us and working without adequate pay.

As I said just yesterday, we are out of time to protect these children, and we are the ones who are responsible for the children. We are the ones who are responsible for the children.

People are waiting in terrible conditions in the desert, and summer in Texas is here. Children are sleeping on the ground and need to be moved to shelters or homes. We need doctors and pediatricians and caregivers.

This bill gives the agencies the funds to care for these children, to reduce the overcrowding at border facilities, to repay the States, and to add immigration judge teams.

The Senate has already passed this bill on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis. Now we should do the same and send this bill to the President for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong ‘yes’ vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the previous question is ordered.
Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. DE LAUER, and SPEIER, Messrs. SOTO and SHERMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MEADOWS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 2500, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to file a supplemental report on the bill, H.R. 2500.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2205

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have Representative BRIAN FITZPATRICK’s name removed from H.R. 2205 as a cosponsor. His name was added inadvertently.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? There was no objection.

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

Mr. BERGMAN. 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 the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LURIA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

HONORING 2018–2019 CHAMPIONS: HILLSIDE BASKETBALL ALL-STARS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend the Hillside Recreational Basketball All-Star teams for their incredible successes this past season. These young athletes and their coaches traveled all over the great State of New Jersey to compete in the New Jersey Basketball Association League.

The sixth and seventh grade athletes trained hard with their dedicated coaches which resulted in both teams winning 14 games. The teams then went on to win an additional four games during their championships. The seventh grade team maintained their 2-year champion streak.

These successes were accomplished thanks to each member’s commitment to teamwork that allowed them to reach the height of their potential. Madam Speaker, I am proud to say congratulations to the Hillside Basketball All-Stars.

GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Gun Violence Awareness Month and to honor the hundreds of thousands of survivors and victims of gun violence.

In 2018, in my city of Philadelphia, there were 351 homicides, and most of these were committed with a gun. What is happening in Philly is consistent with what is happening every day in violence-plagued Black and Brown communities across this country. It is sickening. So is the Senate’s lack of action on commonsense gun reform bills that the House has passed.

While we still need commonsense gun reform, Senator CASEY and I have also introduced a bill that Members from both parties should be able to agree on. H.R. 2585, the Resources for Victims of Gun Violence Act.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join the 50 cosponsors and
the many organizations that are putting their concern for gun violence into action by supporting this bill, and I urge the Senate to act on the bills the House has already passed.

BUILD A WALL
(Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)
Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, today the House joined the Senate in approving almost $4.6 billion in taxpayer money to address the growing security and humanitarian crisis at our southern border. We all share sympathy for the children and individuals who find themselves in suffering conditions at our southern border, but we should not confuse that the action that the House took today addresses the real crux of the problem at our southern border. Indeed, less than 5 percent of the funds we approved will have a realistic impact on reducing the plague of illegal immigration that faces our country.
I call upon my colleagues and I call upon the Speaker, upon our return after the Independence Day recess, to take up this issue and send a clear message around the world that this country intends to enforce its borders and enforce its immigration laws.
Madam Speaker, I support and call upon the Speaker to allow us to provide the funding to build a wall at our southern border and support the President's efforts to control illegal immigration.

THE FIGHT FOR THE CHILDREN WILL CONTINUE
(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)
Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this was a tough week for those of us who, as mothers, have a deep pain for the conditions of our children. It was a difficult week because Mr. Ramirez and his toddler died trying to seek an opportunity in the United States. It was a difficult week because this administration rejected Mr. Ramirez from the Matamoros bridge and forced him to cross the Rio Grande. Today, I voted "no" for the $4.5 billion, the funds that are needed and that passed and were provided for those in need. If my vote was needed to pass the bill, I would have done so.
But I am saddened by the fact that we passed a bill that does not have the strengthened protocols for treating the difficulties of children and their health needs:
It does not have the provisions dealing with the quality of the treatment of the children, the sanitation and safety.
It does not have the idea that children can only remain in a place for 90 days;

It does not have the ability to have a program that talks about or puts in place how these children are treated as relates to their healthcare and other matters.
So, I will continue to fight because these children's lives are important at the border and the Nation, and we will get to a point where we can pass legislation that will treat these children who are suffering and fleeing in the right way.

WE MUST DO BETTER
(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)
Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, once again, I say I am blessed to be an American citizen and honored to be a Member of this Congress.
Today is a bittersweet day for me as, today, I was able to bring my two grandchildren on the floor of this House, a courtesy that we afford each other as Members of this luscious body: my 1-year-old granddaughter, Jimena Luna De La Rosa, and my grandson, Joaquin Cruz De La Rosa.
But, at the same time, we voted for less than what we should have for the lives of so many men, women, and children who seek to come to the greatest land on Earth, the United States of America.
We must do better. We must do more. And it is time that we push back on a President who considers the gold standard to be the gold on a toilet instead of the gold standard that we have come to be known for around the world when it comes to having open arms of welcoming good human beings to this great country, to be part of this great land.

CONGRATULATING THE HECTOR GODINEZ FUNDAMENTAL HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS SOFTBALL TEAM
(Mr. CORREA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)
Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Hector Godinez Fundamental High School women's softball team on their first ever CIF Southern Section championship victory. The team clinched their first ever title for the school and for Santa Ana Unified School District.
Their head coach, Ed Medina, has been the coach since the school opened in 2007 and was named the 2019 Orange County Softball Coach of the Year.
His assistant coaches—Clarissa Castellanos, Kevin Pola, and Selene Pola—are also to be commended.
Again, I congratulate the team, the coaches, and, of course, Principal Jesse Church on a job well done.
Congratulations, Grizzlies.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Members for the part of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:
Mr. MCCaul, Texas
Mr. DUFFY, Wisconsin
Mr. HURD, Texas
Mr. CLOUD, Texas
Mr. SPANO, Florida

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 1903(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy:
Mr. RUTHERFORD, Florida

ISSUES OF THE DAY
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOHMERT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.
Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, so we just took up the humanitarian crisis that is going on at our border and passed the Senate bill, so there will be a tremendous amount of money that will be going to provide more beds, shelter, food, transportation, whatever is needed. The one thing that the Senate bill is especially void of is money to secure our border.
It is something to say that, with all of the problems in the Senate bill, the things that were not addressed in the Senate bill, the fact that it was so much better than the House bill says an awful lot about the House bill and its shortcomings.
We have, still, and will after this bill is signed into law and money is put into use, a crisis on our southern border.
As was pointed out to me after some of us visited Normandy with the Speaker on the 75th anniversary of D-Day, on D-Day, we had 150,000 or so Allied troops that invaded Normandy, over 150,000, a tremendous number, landing craft, parachuting. Yet just in the month of May, that is about how many invaded our southern border—that we caught. We don't know how many didn't get caught.
Some think that for every one we actually catch and in-process, there is one that gets away. We don't know.
We know that there are a great number of people who are not caught because they are picked up on cameras.
and with other information that is gleaned on the border.

But it will continue to be a problem after this money is spent, and there is some concern—it is legitimate—that when you have what the civil litigation would indicate is an attractive nuisance—that is the terminology in a lawsuit—and you don’t put up a fence, a wall, something to impede people from coming into property illegally, then, if they hurt themselves—and the example is people think of is being in a swimming pool or a pool or a pond.

If you have that water on your property, and you don’t bother to put up a fence or a wall, and someone comes onto your property and drowns, you are going to end up paying a tremendous amount of money, normally, to the family of the victim at the bust of your property when it was not properly secured with a fence or a wall.

That is not to say it has to be electrified or some kind of really intense structure. But you need to have something that will impede somebody from coming in and drowning in your water.

Now, the moment of silence earlier, most of us were deeply moved by the picture, horrendously tragic, of a child, who presumably was so close, even sharing the father’s shirt, with her little arm around his neck.

Having had girls growing up, that is an emotional picture for some of us especially.

But we have what most would say is the highest-evolved justice system, judicial system, litigation system in history. It has come through thousands of years of different types of laws, be them way up at the bust of Hammurabi, the Code of Hammurabi, the Justinian Code. We have a Napoleonic Code.

We have had thousands of years of laws, and the civil litigation in this country rest on perhaps the most perfected—a long way from being perfect, but as perfected as it has ever been anywhere.

That is where this concept of attractive nuisance has evolved and arisen from. There is a responsibility when you know there is something so attractive that people will be tempted to break the law and enter that property illegally, potentially, to their own detriment.

What are you supposed to do if you are a caring individual in charge of property? You put up a fence or wall, just like our former President Obama did.

I understand he built a 10-foot wall around his home. That is a good, responsible thing to do. It was good enough for the President when he was in the White House to raise the height of the fence and wall around the White House, and it is good enough for the former President, as he built a wall around his private residence.

It is a good, responsible thing to do by a responsible person in charge of property, not only to provide privacy, but also to keep people from being lured to their own detriment.

It is high time we address that on our southern border. There are very few people in this body, on either side of the aisle, who would say we have an attractive nuisance—that is the terminology in a lawsuit—and you don’t put up a fence, to keep people from coming into property, that we can’t keep having people pour into this country illegally.

But something strange has happened as our friends have taken over the majority in the French Revolution. And there was so much sentiment of getting revenge that it ended up culminating in an Emperor named Napoleon.

The Founding Fathers were not out there to cut off heads. They were out there to grab and preserve liberty, whereas in the French Revolution, there was so much sentiment of getting revenge that it ended up culminating in an Emperor named Napoleon.

We now seem to have so much animus and so much anger. There is some, from time to time, in this body. But some of the most vocal people pushing for impeachment, like my friend Al Green, he, literally, is a friend. He is a Christian brother. I disagree with him strongly on the need for impeachment, but I like the guy. He is my brother. I know he would not breach that oath taken in the Constitution, followed with the Bill of Rights.

Yes, it has taken a while to get them continuing to evolve toward greater perfection. But we have to do something, because if we don’t, if we continue to have people pouring into the United States—when you look at the example of Normandy with 150,000 or so, we had that many illegally invading America in 1 month.

We have to do something because the people pouring in have not been educated on the responsibilities of maintaining self-government. They will end up forcing this country—not intentionally but because they do not understand the responsibility involved in continuing this little experiment in self-government that has lasted 230 years. They will unintentionally give way to either communism or progres­simism, if you prefer that these days, or a pure dictatorship.

It is very disconcerting that, in this country, there is more and more rising emotion between different political thought.

Look at the difference between the American Revolution, the 8 years that it took to win our independence, 1775 to 1783, and toward the end of the year when the Treaty of Paris was signed. It had the name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity.” The British signed that. They thought that would be an oath that they would have to take so seriously in England that they would not breach that oath taken in the name of the “Most Holy and Undivided Trinity.”

Historians know, normally, a government doesn’t last more than 200 years, and they are lucky if they last 200 years. We have gone 230.

Some historians say that they think the big difference between the U.S. Revolution resulting in liberty and the French Revolution resulting in hundreds of thousands of heads being cut off was our Revolution was about liberty.

The Founding Fathers were not out there to cut off heads. They were out there to grab and preserve liberty, whereas in the French Revolution, there was so much sentiment of getting revenge that it ended up culminating in an Emperor named Napoleon.

We now seem to have so much animus and so much anger. There is some, from time to time, in this body. But some of the most vocal people pushing for impeachment, like my friend Al Green, he, literally, is a friend. He is a Christian brother. I disagree with him strongly on the need for impeachment, but I like the guy. He is my brother. I know he would not breach that oath taken in the Constitution, followed with the Bill of Rights.

We should also remember the way they got to the Constitution was when Randolph, from Virginia, proposed that, after 5 weeks of yelling and fussing, that even though they didn’t have money to hire a chaplain, why don’t they take a few days off and gather together, on our Nation’s Independence Day, at a local church there in Philadelphia. They ended up settling on the Reformed Calvinist Church, with the Right Reverend William Rogers presiding, and they worshipped God together. They were led in prayer by Reverend Rogers. They came back after that and gave us the most extraordinary founding document in the history of the world that we still use 232 years later. It was a time of reflection. So, we should, as we look at the Constitution, and we will not be a shining light on a hill. We will be a transit station for people around the world to pass through, hoping for something great but, instead, only seeing a once-great country whose experiment in self-government was destroyed too many years.
EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kate Knudson Wolters</td>
<td>5/13</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,434.00</td>
<td>1,475.53</td>
<td>2,907.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,434.00</td>
<td>1,475.53</td>
<td>2,907.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

1440. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0802; FRL-9994-20-Region 9] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1441. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; SO2 Emission Limitations for United States Steel-Gary Works [EPA-R05-OAR-2018-0126; FRL-9995-67-Region 5] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1442. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0812; FRL-9994-19-Region 9] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1443. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Attainment Plan for Jefferson County SO2 Nonattainment Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0625; FRL-9995-59-Region 4] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1444. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Ethiprole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0483; FRL-9966-11] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1445. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; Minor New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Program Revisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2016-0176; FRL-9995-44-Region 6] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1446. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Mefentrifluconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0002; FRL-9994-51] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1447. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Mefentrifluconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0630; FRL-9994-36] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1450. A letter from the Director, Office of Environment and Energy, FERC, transmittal of FERC’s FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1451. A letter from the Director, Office of Environment and Energy, FERC, transmittal of FERC’s FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1452. A letter from the Director, Office of Environment and Energy, FERC, transmittal of FERC’s FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.


1454. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 18-105, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1455. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a notification pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1456. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 18-106, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1457. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil Rights, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1458. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil Rights, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.
Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical corrections to Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPSRA) regulations and disposal of unused MPRSA funds (Rept. 116–120, Pt. 2).

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 116-5, as follows:

By Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 116-13, as follows:

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. ROSE of California, Mr. HORSEY, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. HUNT of Georgia, Mr. SOTO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HORN of California, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SPANO, Ms. MUCARELLO-Powell, Mr. MART, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRIST, Mr. RUPPENHOFER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. YOHO): H.R. 3328. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to promptly notify appropriate State and local officials to the Committee on Homeland Security to promptly notify appropriate State and local officials to notify potentially affected individuals of such intrusion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

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. CUMMING (for herself, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COX of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DESALVADORI, Ms. ESCORAH, Ms. ESCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GAR- CIA of Texas, Mr. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KOHN, Mr. MENDOZA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROY- BAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCALONE, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. Peters, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California): H.R. 3324. A bill to support the people of Central America and strengthen United States security by addressing the root causes of migration from El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Education and Labor, Armed Services, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Financial Services, Homeland Security, Ways and Means, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 3325. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Commis- sioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to establish uniform processes for medical screening of individuals interdicted between ports of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 3326. A bill to authorize certain counts of terrorist networks activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Home- land Security.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 3327. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to assign the highest priority status for hospital care and medical services provided through the Department of Veterans Affairs to veterans who are former prisoners of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3328. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to ensure that the National Science Foundation to support research on the People's Republic of China of certain technology and intellectual property impor- tant to the national interest of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 Mrs. ROBY (for herself and Mr. COL- LINS of Georgia):

H.R. 3332. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the definition of crime of violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. DUNN):

H.R. 3334. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to require health care providers to maintain patient medical records to the extent required by applicable law, and for other purposes; 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. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BIGGIO, Mr. CENUTI, Mr. DAVIS of Texas, Mr. KANJAR, Mr. KACZmarek, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 3335. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the Work-allowance program administered by the Sec- retary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. TAYLOR):
H.R. 3536. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify lynching as a deprivation of civil rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Mr. SPANO):

H.R. 3537. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to codify the Boots to Business Program, for all purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 3538. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for new markets tax credit investments in the Rural Jobs Zone; on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. PAINTTIA):

H.R. 3539. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop best practices for the establishment and use of behavioral intervention teams at schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 3540. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish the position of the Assistant Director and Student Loan Ombudsman of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, to establish the Office for Students and Young Consumers of the Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 3541. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish a coastal climate change adaptation preparedness and response program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 3542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Indian coal production tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 3543. A bill to ensure that certain loan programs of the Small Business Administration are made available to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, Agriculture, and 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. EVANS (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 3544. A bill to ensure that certain entrepreneurial development services of the Small Business Administration are made available to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 3545. A bill to decriminalize cannabis, to establish an Equitable Licensing Grant Program in the Small Business Administration, for all purposes; to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Small Business, 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. BEYER (for himself and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 3546. A bill to provide incentives for hate crime reporting, provide grants for State-run hate crime hotlines, and establish additional penalties for individuals convicted under the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3547. A bill to establish an interagency Federal agencies from interfering with the marijuana policy of States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. PORTER):

H.R. 3547. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish the position of the Assistant Director and Student Loan Ombudsman of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, to establish the Office for Students and Young Consumers of the Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 3548. A bill to improve data collection and monitoring of the Great Lakes, oceans, bays, estuaries, and coasts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Technology, and 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 Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on deductions for personal casualty losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3550. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit for hiring veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 3551. A bill to ensure that Members of Congress have access to Federal facilities in order to exercise their constitutional oversight responsibilities; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HAYES, Mr. SIEES, Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MUCARSEWS-POWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. NEUMOESE, Mr. CASE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MENG, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 3552. A bill to amend the NICCS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 to provide notification to relevant law enforcement agencies in the event that a background check conducted by the National Instant Criminal Background Check System determines that a person may not receive a firearm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WATSON-COLEMAN, Ms. HAYES, Mr. RUSE of New York, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MUCARSEWS-POWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. NEUMOESE, Mr. CASE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CHILTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SIEES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 3553. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to ensure that all firearms are traceable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MUCARSEWS-POWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. NEUMOESE, Mr. CHILTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SIEES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 3554. A bill to incentivize State reporting systems that allow mental health professionals to submit information on certain individuals deemed purposes of prohibiting firearm possession by such individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3555. A bill to amend the Department of Education Operations and Program Authorization Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require publication of information relating to religious exemptions to the requirements of title IX of the Education Amendments for fiscal years 2020 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 3556. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced excise tax rate for portable, electronically-aerated bait containers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DeLBENE:

H.R. 3557. A bill to prohibit the imposition of duties on the importation of goods under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 3558. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study on the state of hospital infrastructure in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 3559. A bill to control the export of electronic waste in order to ensure that such waste does not become the source of counterfeited goods that may reenter military and civilian electronics supply chains in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 3560. A bill to provide assistance for the operation of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail Visitor Center in Nebraska City, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. HUZGENE, Mr. MCADAMS, and Mr. KROMY:

H.R. 3561. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to require the Financial Stability Oversight Council to consider alternative approaches before determining that a U.S. nonbank financial company shall be supervised by the Board of Governors of
By Ms. FUDGE (for herself and Mr. RAHMEYER):
H.R. 3562. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the food and nutrition programs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NOR顿, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. MALORI, Mr. VAJRA, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KAPFTUR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSI, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. TLIAB, Ms. MENG, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. NYE, Ms. McGOVERN, Ms. DILEAURO, Ms. DELAURLE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. Cisneros, Ms. POCON, and Ms. CASSAmpio):
H.R. 3563. A bill to encourage the implementation and main- tenance of health savings accounts is approved under section 280B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that eligibility to contribute to health savings accounts is as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Jurisdiction.

By Mr. GOSAR:
H.R. 3564. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the Optional Practical Training Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Jurisdiction.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. HARIS, Mrs. ROGERS of Washington, and Mr. GOMER):
H.R. 3565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that eligibility to contribute to health savings accounts is as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. RouZER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio):
H.R. 3566. A bill to help individuals receiving disaster insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act obtain rehabilitative services and return to the workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HOULAHAN (for herself and Mr. COOK):
H.R. 3567. A bill to modify the requirements relating to the acquisition and disposal of certain rare earth materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):
H.R. 3568. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to award grants to States for a tick identification pilot program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Ms. PRESSLEY):
H.R. 3569. A bill to provide grants to States to encourage the implementation and main- tenance of health savings accounts is approved under section 280B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that eligibility to contribute to health savings accounts is as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BERA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARBON, Mr. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KLIMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LOWEY, Mrs. COWEN of New York, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. MEeks, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MUCAREL-FOW- KELL, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. NORTON, Mr. O’HALLERAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SHERMER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEHR, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. TIDWELL, Ms. UNDER- wood, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. Watson COLEMAN, and Mr. WELCH):
H.R. 3570. A bill to amend the Commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Mr. Wilson of South Carolina):
H.R. 3571. A bill to establish an Office of Subnational Diplomacy within the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LOPENIK for herself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. THOMP- son of California, Ms. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DIASALUNNER, Mrs. Torres of California, Mr. Cárdenas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CORREA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COX of California, Ms. PORTER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. PED LEW of California, Mr. G. JOHNSON of New York, Mr. DAY of California, Mr. BERA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. Cisneros, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SHEARMAN, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. TIDWELL, Mr. RUZ, Ms. SPEHR, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. LEVIN of California):
H.R. 3572. A bill to require States to carry out congressional redistricting in accordance with plans developed and enacted into law by independent redistricting commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. Torres SMALL of New Mexico):
H.R. 3573. A bill to increase research, educa- tion, and treatment for cerebral cavernous malformations, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. HAALAND, and Mr. Torres SMALL of New Mexico):
H.R. 3574. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the establishment of a small business voucher program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. WIL- son of South Carolina, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. PORTENBERRY, Mr. FLISCHMANN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCBRIDE, Mr. McKNELL, Mr. SENSENBRNER, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. TONCO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):
H.R. 3575. A bill to establish the IMAGF for Every Foundation to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. MCCARTHY (for herself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, and Miss RICE of New York):
H.R. 3579. A bill to direct the Postmaster General to conduct a study on retrofitting mail collection boxes with narrow mail slots to prevent theft of mail, and for other pur- poses; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MCADAMS:
H.R. 3580. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act and the Public Health Ser- vice Act to improve the reporting of abortion data to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, and Miss RICE of New York):
H.R. 3581. A bill to require States to carry out congressional redistricting in accordance with plans developed and enacted into law by independent redistricting commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERCER:
H.R. 3582. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the scope of the Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. GOHME, Mr. Fletcher of Georgia, Mrs. SENSENBRNER, Mr. GOs, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsyl- vania):
H.R. 3583. A bill to amend section 116 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. PAS- CREL, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. SCHRADE):

H.R. 3584. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for certain amendments relating to reporting requirements with respect to clinical diagnostic laboratories, for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means; to be sub judice determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD (for himself, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CRIST, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. GARTZ, Mr. YOHO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BILLIKIRIS, Ms. SPANO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. MAST, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. WALTS):

H.R. 3585. A bill to provide for a moratorium on oil and gas leasing and exploration on the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Florida until 2026, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Resources.

By Mr. SCOT GADZER (for himself, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CORREA, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. O’HALLERAN):

H.R. 3586. A bill to promote energy savings in residential and commercial buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. FRENDEN F. BOYLIE of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. FLETCHER):

H.R. 3587. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the effective date for the modification to net operating loss deductions in Public Law 115-97; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COX of California, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 3588. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to take an initiative on improving the capacity of military criminal investigative organizations to prevent child sexual exploitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia):

H.R. 3589. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Greg LeMond, in recognition of his service to the Nation as an athlete, activist, role model, and community leader; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself and Mr. GIANFORTE):

H.R. 3590. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a refundable tax credit to increase the take-home pay of American workers and enhance their financial stability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3592. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent certain alcohol and substance misuse; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. GIANFORTE):

H.R. 3593. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise the amount of minimum allotments under the Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HURD of Texas (for himself and Mr. McCaul):

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution strongly condemning human rights violations, violence against civilians, and cooperation with Iran by the Houthis movement and its allies in Yemen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H. Res. 467. A resolution recognizing the essential contributions of frontline health workers to strengthening the United States national security and economic prosperity. To the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 468. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Defense should review section 504 of title 10, United States Code, for purposes related to enlisting certain aliens in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KLEINEROS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCCGOVERN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. QUIEGLEY):

H. Res. 469. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall Uprising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN of California (for himself, Mr. GLANDER, Mr. ROUDA, and Mr. COX of California):

H. Res. 470. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 1, 2019, as "National Health Literacy Day" to recognize the value of health literacy in transforming and improving health and health care for all people in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Res. 471. A resolution expressing support for the designation of 2019 as the "International Year of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. HASHTINGS, Ms. BUSTOS, Mr. MCCGOVERN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SQUIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MOORE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. BASS, Ms. VARGAS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. KRANNA, Mr. CINEROS, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H. Res. 472. A resolution requesting the President to strongly condemn Jamal Khater’s killing, hold accountable individuals identified as culpable, and condemn imprisonment of and violence against journalists around the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. LOFGREN:

H.R. 3524. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform system of National Defense."

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 3525. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 3527. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 14, and 18 of the Constitution of the United States; the authority to raise and support an army, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3528. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MURPHY:

H.R. 3529. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 3530. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have power 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 of Officer thereof.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3531. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes) and Clause 18 (providing to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3532. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. ROBY:

H.R. 3533. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3534. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. ROYDNE DAVIS of Illinois:
H.R. 3535.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. BACON:
H.R. 3536.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:
H.R. 3538.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. FERGUSON:
H.R. 3539.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States
By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:
H.R. 3540.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
"The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the general Welfare of the United States; . . . ."
By Mr. CARBAJAL:
H.R. 3541.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2
By Mr. GIANFORTE:
H.R. 3542.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Mr. GOLDEN:
H.R. 3543.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, whereby Congress shall have the power to provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States
By Mr. EVANS:
H.R. 3545.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
"The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . . ."
By Mr. BEYER:
H.R. 3546.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Ms. BONAMICI:
H.R. 3547.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
By Mr. BLUMENAUER:
H.R. 3548.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:
H.R. 3549.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment XVI of the U.S. Constitution
By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:
H.R. 3550.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment XVI of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:
H.R. 3551.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
THE U.S. CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS
CLAUSE 18
The Congress shall have power . . . 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. CICILLINE:
H.R. 3552.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Mr. CICILLINE:
H.R. 3553.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:
H.R. 3554.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Mr. CRIST:
H.R. 3556.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Ms. DeJOUN:
H.R. 3557.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. ENGEL:
H.R. 3558.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1
By Mr. ESPAILLAT:
H.R. 3559.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I of the United States Constitution
By Mr. FORTENBERRY:
H.R. 3560.
The Congress shall have Power—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 or Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:
The Congress shall have Power—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 or Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:
By Ms. HOULAHAN:
H.R. 3561.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article One of the Constitution, section 8, clause 18:
By Ms. HOULAHAN:
H.R. 3562.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."
By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:
H.R. 3563.
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 I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. GOSAR:
H.R. 3564.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. GOSAR:
H.R. 3565.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 1
By Ms. HOULAHAN:
H.R. 3566.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 1
By Mr. KATKO:
H.R. 3568.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8, clause 1
By Mr. KATKO:
H.R. 3569.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8—to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce among the states.
By Mr. TED LIEU of California:
H.R. 3570.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.
By Mr. TED LIEU of California:
H.R. 3571.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. LOFGREN:
H.R. 3572.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power to enact laws governing the time, place, and manner of elections for Members of the House of Representatives. Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution gives Congress the power to enact laws to enforce Section 2 of such Amendment, which requires Representatives to be apportioned among the several States according to their number.
By Mr. LUJAN:
H.R. 3573.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that "Congress shall have Power 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 Ms. SPANBERGER:
H.R. 393.

By Ms. THOMPSON of California:
H.R. 3989.

By Mr. TRONE:
H.R. 3991.

By Mr. BELCH:
H.R. 3992.

By Ms. TLAIB:
H.R. 3990.

By Mr. WELCH:
H.R. 3993.

By Mr. MCADAMS:
H.R. 3994.

By Mr. NEWMAN:
H.R. 3995.

By Ms. THOMAS of Georgia:
H.R. 3996.

By Mr. LEE of New York:
H.R. 3997.

By Ms. DAVIS of California:
H.R. 3998.

By Mr. MOORE of Texas:
H.R. 3999.

By Mr. RUSH:
H.R. 4028.

By Mr. TLAIB:
H.R. 4029.

By Ms. SHERRILL:
H.R. 4030.

By Mr. LEE of California:
H.R. 4031.

By Mr. LEE of New York:
H.R. 4032.

By Mr. HARKIN:
H.R. 4033.

By Mr. MCNULTY:
H.R. 4034.

By Mr. McGovern:
H.R. 4035.

By Mr. RUSSELL:
H.R. 4036.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4037.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4038.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:
H.R. 4039.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:
H.R. 4040.

By Mr. NELSON:
H.R. 4041.

By Mr. ADAMS:
H.R. 4042.

By Ms. BASS:
H.R. 4043.

By Mr. REED:
H.R. 4044.

By Mr. MOORE of New York:
H.R. 4045.

By Mr. ROY:
H.R. 4046.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida:
H.R. 4047.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:
H.R. 4048.

By Mr. HASTINGS:
H.R. 4049.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:
H.R. 4050.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:
H.R. 4051.

By Mr. HASTINGS:
H.R. 4052.

By Mr. ROY:
H.R. 4053.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:
H.R. 4054.

By Mr. PALMER:
H.R. 4055.

By Mr. ROY:
H.R. 4056.

By Mr. MCADAMS:
H.R. 4057.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 4058.

By Mr. KILMER:
H.R. 4059.

By Ms. SHAH:
H.R. 4060.

By Mr. ROY:
H.R. 4061.

By Mr. PALMER:
H.R. 4062.

By Ms. ROY:
H.R. 4063.

By Mr. MCADAMS:
H.R. 4064.

By Ms. TLAIB:
H.R. 4065.

By Mr. SCHUMACHER:
H.R. 4066.

By Ms. WHITE:
H.R. 4067.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON:
H.R. 4068.

By Mr. ROY:
H.R. 4069.

By Ms. WARNER:
H.R. 4070.

By Mr. LEE:
H.R. 4071.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4072.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4073.

By Ms. WATERS:
H.R. 4074.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4075.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4076.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4077.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4078.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4079.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4080.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4081.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4082.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4083.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4084.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4085.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4086.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4087.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4088.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4089.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4090.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4091.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4092.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4093.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4094.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4095.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4096.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4097.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4098.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4099.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4100.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4101.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4102.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4103.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4104.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4105.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4106.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4107.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4108.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4109.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4110.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4111.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4112.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4113.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4114.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4115.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4116.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4117.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4118.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4119.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4120.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4121.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4122.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4123.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4124.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4125.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4126.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4127.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4128.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4129.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4130.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4131.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4132.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4133.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4134.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4135.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4136.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4137.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4138.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4139.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4140.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4141.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4142.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4143.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4144.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4145.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4146.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4147.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4148.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4149.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4150.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 4151.
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.

Eternal Lord, the center of our joy, we come to You, drawn by Your unconditional love. Lord, give us reverential awe as You open our eyes to see Your power and majesty.

Help our lawmakers become aware of Your presence, giving them Your peace and illuminating their paths. May they rejoice because You are their refuge. Lord, bless their families, surrounding them with the shield of Your favor. Draw our Senators close to You and to one another in humility and service.

And, Lord, we thank You for the faithfulness of the 2019 U.S. Senate summer pages as they prepare to leave us. We pray that You would bless and keep them. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 90 seconds as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALZHEIMER’S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, June is Alzheimer’s and Brain Awareness Month.

It is important to recognize the impact Alzheimer’s has on families in Iowa and across the country and to recognize the cost to taxpayers because of the care it takes in the last years of their lives. This disease robs Americans of their memories and impacts their ability to speak, pay attention, and exercise judgment.

The best way for Congress to help with Alzheimer’s disease is to ensure adequate research funding to find treatments. As Congress considers appropriations for next year, we should continue to fund research and work toward curing this disease.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on another point, the Supreme Court made a decision this week that I very much disagree with. I am an advocate for the Freedom of Information Act and for the public’s business being public, and this Supreme Court decision inhibited that.

In a self-governed society, the people ought to know what their government is up to. Transparency laws, like the Freedom of Information Act, help to provide access to information in the face of an opaque and obstinate government. Unfortunately, a recent Supreme Court ruling and new regulations at the EPA and the Department of the Interior are undermining access to there being public information.

In other words, the public’s business ought to be public. So I am working on legislation to address these developments and to promote access to government records. Americans deserve an accountable government, and transparency leads to accountability.

TRIBUTE TO NICK NURSE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on a little lighter note, I am proud to say that the NBA season concluded with a University of Northern Iowa graduate’s being able to call himself a champion.

The Toronto Raptors’ head coach, Nick Nurse, graduated from my alma mater. He played for the University of Northern Iowa Panthers from 1985 to 1989. Nick went on to coach numerous teams, including for Grand View University in Des Moines. Nick knows how to reignite hometown pride. He led the first and only boys’ Class 3-A championship for Kuemper Catholic High School in Carroll, IA. He is a class act. Congratulations to Nick.

I yield the floor.

Mr. McCONNEL. Mr. President, 8 weeks ago, the administration sent Congress an urgent request for humanitarian money for the border. For 8 weeks, we have seen evidence nearly every day that the conditions have been getting worse. Yet, during all of this time, our Democratic House colleagues have been unable to produce a clean measure to provide this humanitarian funding with its having any chance of becoming law.

The proposal they finally passed this week was way to the left of the mainstream. The President made it clear it would earn a veto, not a signature. Even so, in an abundance of fairness, the Senate voted on Speaker PELOSI’s effort—poison pill riders and all. It earned just 37 votes. The House proposal earned 37 votes here. Fortunately, we do have a chance to make
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law this week on a hugely bipartisan basis.

The Senate advanced a clean, simple humanitarian funding bill yesterday by a huge margin. Thanks to Chairman SHELBY and Senator LEAHY, this bipartisan bill passed through the Appropriations Committee 30 to 1, and it passed the full Senate yesterday—now listen to this—84 to 8. We sent that clean bill over to the House by a vote of 84 to 8. The Shelby-Leahy legislation has unified the Appropriations Committee, and it has unified the Administration.

The Administration would sign it into law.

So all that our House colleagues need to do is help the men, women, and children on the border this week is to pass this unifying bipartisan bill and send it to the President. For weeks, we have heard our House Democratic colleagues speaking a lot about the poor conditions, the overstretched facilities, the insufficient supplies. Our bill gives them the chance today to actually do something about it.

Now, I understand that instead of moving forward with this bipartisan bill, the Speaker is signaling she may choose to drag out the process even more and might persist in some variation of the leftwing demands that caused the House bill to fail dramatically in the Senate yesterday. I understand that some of the further changes the House Democrats are discussing may be unobjectionable things the Trump administration may be able to help to secure for them administratively.

Yet it is crystal clear that some of these new demands would drag this bipartisan bill way back to the left and jeopardize the Shelby-Leahy consensus product that unified the Senate and that is so close to becoming law—this close.

For example, I understand that the House Democrats may ask the Speaker to insist on—listen to this—cutting the Supplemental funding for Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the Department of Defense. In the middle of this historic surge on the border, they want to claw back some of this badly needed money from the men and women who are down there on the frontlines. It looks like these cuts would represent pay cuts to ICE staff, including pay that people have already earned, and cuts to the money for investigating child trafficking.

Chairman SHELBY and Senator LEAHY have already reached a bipartisan agreement. Both sides have already compromised. We are standing at the 5-yard line. Yet, apparently, some in the House want to dig back into that abolish ICE playbook and throw a far-left partisan wrench into the whole thing.

Let me be perfectly clear. I am glad the Speaker and the administration are discussing these outstanding issues, but if the House Democrats and the Senate back some partisan effort to disrupt our bipartisan progress, we will simply move to table it. The U.S. Senate is not going to pass a border funding bill that will cut the money for ICE and the Department of Defense. It is not going to happen. We already have our compromise. The Shelby-Leahy Senate bill is the only game in town. It is time to quit playing games. It is time to pass it.

I urge my colleagues across the Capitol to take up the clean, bipartisan bill that the Senate passed 84 to 8 and, without any more unnecessary delays, send it on to President Trump for his signature.

TOBACCO-FREE YOUTH ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, just last month, I introduced legislation, along with my colleague from Virginia, Senator KAINE, to address a serious and growing public health issue. As Senator KAINE and I laid out in May, the growing popularity and accessibility of tobacco and e-cigarettes and vapor products are endangering America’s youth.

The CDC estimates that in 2018 youth e-cigarette use in America increased by 1.5 million. So we introduced legislation that would accomplish something very important—raising the minimum age for purchasing tobacco and vapor products to 21 nationwide. We want to put a huge dent in these pathways to childhood addiction and help get these products out of high schools altogether.

Now, as a Virginian and a Kentuckian, neither Senator KAINE nor I lack an appreciation for the history of tobacco in America. For generations, tobacco has been a huge part of our States and, indeed, the whole Nation’s early prosperity. Yet we also know that e-cigarettes are a dangerous measure—and about as half-baked and dangerous as we have seen on the floor in quite some time. It should be soundly rejected.

I thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED for their leadership throughout this process. They produced legislation that each Member of this body should be proud of. Particularly in these troubled times, this is exactly—exactly—the message the Senate needs to send. I look forward to passing it today.

Passing the NDAA itself is not the only important message the Senate will send this week on national security. On Friday morning, we will vote on a badly ill-conceived amendment that would literally make our Nation less secure and make American servicemen and women less safe. I respect my colleagues, but this amendment from Senator UDALL and others is a half-baked and dangerous measure—about as half-baked and dangerous as we have seen on the floor in quite some time. It should be soundly rejected.

We know that our Democratic colleagues have political differences with President Trump—I think the whole country has gotten that message pretty loud and clear—but they have chosen a terrible time and a completely irresponsible manner to express them. Rather than work with the President, who shares the goal of avoiding war with Iran, they have gratuitously chosen to make him the enemy.

I want to repeat that. Rather than work with the President to deter our actual enemies, they have chosen to make him the enemy.

At the very moment that Iran has been stepping up its aggression throughout the Middle East, these Senators are proposing radical new restrictions on the administration’s ability to defend U.S. interests and our partners.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter entirely, later today, the Senate will vote to fulfill a solemn responsibility. For the 59th consecutive year, we will pass the National Defense Authorization Act. I hope and expect we will do it by a wide, bipartisan margin.

It would be difficult to overstate the importance of this legislation to the ongoing missions of our Nation’s men and women in uniform. The NDAA is simultaneously a target to guide the modernization of our all-volunteer force; a supply line to restore readiness and keep U.S. personnel equipped with the most cutting-edge lethal capabilities; a promise of critical support services to military families; and a declaration to both our allies and adversaries of America’s strategic resolve.

This year’s bill authorizes the investments that will support all these bills and a major pay raise for military personnel to boot.

I am especially proud that it supports the ongoing missions of Kentucky’s installations and the many military families who call my State home.

The NDAA is a product of a robust, bipartisan process that has consumed our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee for weeks. Nearly 300 amendments were adopted during markup. So today, once again, I would like to thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED for their leadership throughout this process. They produced legislation that each Member of this body should be proud of. Particularly in these troubled times, this is exactly—exactly—the message the Senate needs to send. I look forward to passing it today.
The Udall amendment would require the administration to secure explicit authorization from Congress before our forces would be able to respond to all kinds of potential Iranian attacks. That would include attacks on American civilians overseas. Let me say that again. Some of our colleagues want us to go out of our way and create a brand-new obstacle that would block the President from swiftly responding if Iran attacks American civilians, our U.S. diplomatic facilities, or Israeli or other military forces of an ally or partner, or if Iran closes the Strait of Hormuz. In all of these scenarios, the Udall amendment would hamstring the executive branch from reacting quickly. In modern warfare, time is of the essence. The War Powers Resolution explicitly recognizes the reality that administrations may need to respond quickly and with flexibility.

This amendment could even constrain our military from acting to prevent imminent attack. As written, it appears to suggest they must absorb the attack, take the attack first before defending themselves. And even then, for how long would they be allowed to conduct retaliatory strikes? Complete and total absurdity. Totally dangerous.

Let’s take an example. Iran attacks Israel. No timely response from the United States, especially if Congress happens to be on recess. Iran attacks American citizens. The President’s hands would be tied. This is never how the American Presidency has worked, for a very good reason.

So I would ask my colleagues to stop obsessing about Donald Trump for a moment and think about a scenario involving a future or past President. Hypothetically, then, would it be appropriate for Congress to tie a President’s hands with legislation preventing military action to defend NATO allies from a Russian attack without explicit congressional authorization? If conflict came in August and the United States and its NATO allies didn’t act decisively, frontline states could be gobbled up before Congress could even convene to consider an AUMF.

The Udall amendment would represent a huge departure from the basic flexibility that Presidents in both parties have always had to take immediate military steps, short of a full-scale war, to respond to immediate crises.

“This ploy is being advertised as some kind of courageous reassessment by Congress of our constitutional authority, but it is nothing of the sort. It is a departure from our constitutional traditions and norms.

Now, I am talking about a full-scale war with Iran—not the President; not the administration. Heaven forbid, if that situation were to arrive, consultation with Congress and widespread public support would be essential. The Udall amendment is something completely different. It defines self-defense in a laughably narrow way and then in all other situations proposes that President Trump should be stripped of the basic powers of his office unless Democrats in Congress write him a permission slip. I don’t think so.

This would be a terrible idea at any moment, but especially as Iran is escalating its violence and searching for any sign of American weakness.

So I would ask my colleagues: Do not embolden Iran. Do not weaken our deterrence. Do not undermine our diplomacy. Do not tie the hands of our military commanders. Reject this dangerous mistake when we vote on the Udall amendment tomorrow.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1790, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A 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.

Pending:

McConnell (for Inhofe) modified amendment No. 764, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Romney) amendment No. 861 (to amendment No. 764), to provide that funds authorized by the Act are available for the defense of the Armed Forces and United States citizens against attack by foreign hostile forces.

McConnell amendment No. 862 (to amendment No. 861), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 863 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 764), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 864 (to amendment No. 863), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions: McConnell amendment No. 865, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 866 (to the instructions) amendment No. 865), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 867 (to amendment No. 866), of a perfecting nature.

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.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled for noon today be at 11:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as the leader and I announced yesterday, we have an agreement in place to vote on passage of the Defense authorization bill today and then on an amendment to the bill tomorrow, led by Senators Udall, Kaine, Merkley, Murphy, Paul, and Lee, to accommodate all Senators who wish to vote. That is why we are doing it tomorrow. If the Udall amendment is passed, it would be adopted to the Defense authorization bill even though the vote occurs afterward.

I want to thank the leader for understanding our position that the Senate ought to vote on this important amendment, which in essence would prohibit funds for hostilities with Iran without an affirmative authorization from Congress. Congress gets to approve or disapprove wars. Period. It is crucial for the Senate and Congress as a whole to examine potential conflicts and to exercise our authority in matters of war and peace.

Let’s start with the facts. Ever since President Trump withdrew from the Iran nuclear deal, our two countries have been on a path toward conflict. For the past month, we have been locked in a cycle of escalating tensions with Iran. Iran attacked a tanker in the Gulf region and shot down a U.S. surveillance drone. The U.S. Government has responded to both provocations, and the President reportedly considered and then pulled back on a military strike.

The American people are worried—and rightly so—that even if the President isn’t eager for war, he may bumble us into one. Small provocations in the Middle East can often spin out of control. Our country has learned that the hard way. When the President is surrounded by hawkish advisers like John Bolton and Secretary Pompeo, the danger is even more acute.

So while the majority leader says there is no one talking about war, “that is only true until the folks do start talking about war, and by then, the chance to clarify that this President requires congressional authorization before engaging in major hostilities may have passed us by.”

And this not talking about war? Well, the President said he was 10 minutes away from major provocation, if the reports are correct. It would have been on Iranian soil, three missile bases. And the President also pointed out, in effect: We will smash Iran, blow it to smithereens—or something to that effect. People are talking about war. This President is.
Even though it is plainly written in the Constitution that the legislature alone, not the Executive, has the power to declare war, the Trump administration is already signaling that it doesn’t need Congress. The President and his team are playing up links between al-Qaeda/Qatari mercenary networks and the stage for them to claim legal authority under the sweeping 2001 authorization of military force to strike Iran without congressional approval.

The President himself, asked if he believes he has the authority to initiate military action against Iran without first going to Congress, replied, “I do.” He continued, “I do like keeping Congress abreast, but I don’t have to do it legally.”

So when it comes to a potential war with Iran, Mr. President Trump, yes, you do. You do. You do.

The Founding Fathers—our greatest wisdom in this country—worried about houses of power in the executive branch for precisely this reason.

As James Madison wrote to Jefferson, who was not there when they were writing the Constitution—he was plenipotentiary to France—here is what Madison wrote to Jefferson:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war to the Legislature.

That is Madison, who put more into this Constitution than anyone else.

Let me read it again. It is clear as a bell. Madison wrote to Jefferson:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war to the Legislature.

There were ever a President who fits that description, it is Donald Trump.

The Framers worried about an overreaching Executive like the one we have now for quite some time, if ever. So if it comes to it, we should expect the President to challenge Congress’s war powers. He has basically already told us that he would.

So my colleagues should vote to strengthen our ability to oversee this President’s strategy with Iran. That is what the bipartisan Udall amendment would do, nothing more. There has been some fearmongering about how the amendment might tie the hands of our military. It would not. It is explicitly written in no way should it be construed to prevent the U.S. military from responding to an act of aggression or from acting in self-defense.

It is high time that Congress reestablish itself as this Nation’s decider of war and peace. We have been content too long to let the Executive take all of the initiatives and responsibility for military action abroad. The American people are weary of the endless conflicts in the Middle East and the loss of American lives and American treasure.

The Udall amendment would mark the beginning of Congress reasserting its constitutional powers. I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote yes tomorrow.

G20 ECONOMIC SUMMIT

Mr. President, President Trump has arrived at the G20 economic summit in Japan before traveling for a state visit in South Korea. Already, the President has managed to insult our long-standing allies, including Germany and Japan, the host nation.

Rather than strengthening our alliances, here are two important things the President should do at the G20:

1. First, Russia and Vladimir Putin. When President Trump sits down with the Russian President, he must send an unmistakable warning that the United States will not tolerate foreign interference in our elections in 2020. President Trump has no excuse. The Mueller report, FBI Director Wray, virtually our entire intelligence community concluded that Russia was interfering in our elections and that 2020 would be the next big show.

2. Second, China and President Xi. Now that trade negotiations between our countries seemed to have stalled, there is a chance to put them back on track. For that to happen, the President must remain strong. He cannot go soft now and accept a bad deal that falls short of reforming China’s rapacious economic policies—cyber espionage, forced technology transfers, state-sponsorship, and, worst of all, denial of market access.

President Trump, you know it. We have talked about it. You have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to reform China’s economic relations with the world and put American businesses and American workers on a level playing field. Stay tough. Don’t give in. Make sure Huawei cannot come to the United States and we cannot supply it. Enough to our companies to defend—"against an attack upon the United States Armed Forces to defend"—to defend—"against an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, its Armed Forces."

1. What does that mean? What does it mean to defend against an attack? I don’t know. I am not sure. If an F-15 pilot is shot upon in international airspace, I guess he can deploy countermeasures—chaff—to disrupt the missile. Can he shoot back? Can he shoot back at the Iranian missile battery that shot at him?

Let’s take a page from history. In World War II in response to the exact kinds of attacks against commercial shipping and the U.S. Navy on the high seas that we have seen from Iran in the last few weeks. However, that operation didn’t commence for 4 days; it was 4 days after a U.S. Navy frigate hit one of the Iranian mines before we struck Afghanistan, Bahrain, Qatar, and elsewhere. That is because we will be voting tomorrow morning on an amendment that says, very simply: “No funds may be used to conduct hostilities against the Government of Iran, against the Armed Forces of Iran, or in the territory of Iran, except pursuant to an Act or a joint resolution of Congress specifically authorizing such hostilities.”

That amendment is simple—I would say simple-minded—but it is simply an amendment to restrict the use of the United States military against the Ayatollahs who are currently conducting attacks against the United States and our interests on a regular and growing basis.

Let’s just take a case in point. The earlier version of this amendment included no exception—no exception whatsoever—for our troops to defend themselves against an attack by Iran. You might say that is a careless omission. I would, however, say that even the amendment that was changed after I pointed out that omission just goes to show you that the root of this amendment is Trump derangement syndrome.

It does have an exception now. Let’s look at that: “Nothing can be construed as an authorization to use the United States Armed Forces to defend”—to defend—“against an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces."

1. What does that mean? What does it mean to defend against an attack? I don’t know. I am not sure. If an F-15 pilot is shot upon in international airspace, I guess he can deploy countermeasures—chaff—to disrupt the missile. Can he shoot back? Can he shoot back at the Iranian missile battery that shot at him?

Let’s say our troops who are garisoned in places like Iraq and Syria have incoming mortar fire by an Iranian proxy militia. I guess they can defend and cover in a concrete bunker. I guess that is defense. Can they use counterbattery fire to shoot back at that mortar firing position? I don’t know. I don’t know. Can they? Beats me.

We have thousands of troops stationed at Al Udeid Air Base, the main airbase from which we conducted operations against the Islamic State. Let’s say they have a missile coming in. I guess they can defend and cover in a concrete bunker. I guess that is defense. Can they use counterbattery fire to shoot back at that missile down? Can they fire back at the missile battery that shot that missile, which has many more to fire? I don’t know. Can they? It seems like offense to me. Maybe it is defense.

Let’s take a page from history. In 1988, Ronald Reagan authorized one of the largest naval engagements since World War II in response to the exact kinds of attacks against commercial shipping and the U.S. Navy on the high seas that we have seen from Iran in the last few weeks. However, that operation didn’t commence for 4 days; it was 4 days after a U.S. Navy frigate hit one of the Iranian mines before we struck
back. Is that in defense against an Iranian attack? It doesn’t seem that it would be, to me. I don’t know.

What we are debating here is how many lawyers can dance on a head of a pin when our soldiers are in harm’s way. We know that if they are shot upon, they can fire back, and they can eliminate that threat without any politician in Washington or any lawyer at the Department of Defense looking over their shoulders and second-guessing them. That is not what they get from this amendment, though.

Consider also the consequences. Many of the speakers today will say this is about descaling tension in the Middle East—deescalating. Who is escalating it? Who is the one firing on American aircraft? Not Donald Trump. Who is interfering with the freedom of navigation on the high seas? It is not Donald Trump; it is the Ayatollahs. They are the ones who have manufactured this conflict. They know that the United States is on the strategic offensive and that we have the initiative against Iran for the first time in 40 years.

This amendment, though, would only embolden the Ayatollahs to continue the campaign of the last 2 months of gradually marching up the escalatory ladder. It started with threats. Then it was an attack on foreign vessels at port. Then it was an attack on foreign vessels on the high seas. Then it was an attack on an unmanned American aircraft. Next it might be an attack on a manned American aircraft or a U.S. ship. And the message we are going to send is this: Well, the Congress thinks that the Commander in Chief and, for that matter, battalion commanders on the ground don’t have the authority and the flexibility they need to take the appropriate response, as opposed to cowering inside bunkers and using some defensive measures.

Let’s also think about the language of this amendment. A lot of people are going to come here and say that this is about our constitutional authority, and we need to reclaim our authority, and we have given up too much authority to the executive branch. In a lot of instances I would agree with that. But this amendment is only about Iran. It is not about China; it is not about Russia—even though this President has forced our Democratic friends to finally make some defensive measures.

This is only about Iran in the context of Iran shooting down an American aircraft just a week ago. What better message can you send that this is not about our constitutional authority? This is about the kind of provocation about the kind of a Commander in Chief whom they dislike at a time when a foreign nation is targeting our aircraft and our service members.

This amendment would be a loud and clear message to the Ayatollahs that we will not strike back, that they can escalate even further, and that there will not be swift reprisal. If there is, it will generate intense controversy in our country. It will only embolden them further to march up that escalatory ladder and threaten American lives. It is a hall pass for Iranian escalation, really.

Look, there is no amendment, no bill, no paper resolution that can change the iron laws of geopolitics. Strength deters and weakness provokes. Wars are not won by paper resolutions. They are won by iron resolution. But this amendment embodies irresolution, weakness. This is not the time.

This Congress on a good day can rename a post office, and that is only after months and months of debate about the post office. Are you telling me—are you telling me that if Iran shoots down an American aircraft or continues attacks on partners like the United Arab Emirates, then this Congress in a matter of minutes and hours is going to pass a resolution authorizing the use of force to respond to that kind of provocation? Please.

There is a reason we have one Commander in Chief, not 535 commanders in chief—or, I say again, 535 battalion commanders, the level at which some of these decisions ought to be made. Think about the kind of debates we have, the know-nothings we have seen here in Washington over the last couple of weeks who would say: Oh, it wasn’t Iran that made the attack. OK, it was Iran, but maybe it wasn’t authorized, so we can’t do anything. It was Iran. OK, it was authorized, but it didn’t really do that much damage. It is kind of like the old line of: It is not my dog. He didn’t bite you. You kicked him first. That is what that debate would devolve into while our troops are at risk.

This is a terrible amendment. It will do nothing but put more American lives at risk and imperil our interests and our partners throughout the region.

I know that the minority leader said earlier that he is worried about the President bumbling into war. He said it last week on TV too. Nations don’t bumble into war. He and others have raised the prospect of endless wars, the wars we have been fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. They are long, and we have made lots of twists and turns on the way. But let’s not forget that many of the Democratic leaders in the House are the authors of these wars. We didn’t bumble into those. They were considered, deliberate decisions.

President Trump said just a couple days ago that he is not talking about that kind of operation. He is talking about the exact kind of thing that Ronald Reagan did in response to Iranian aggression on the high seas. That didn’t start a war. Ronald Reagan didn’t start a war when he retaliated against Libya for acts of terrorism against American citizens. In 1986, President Ronald Reagan didn’t start a war when he struck Syria in 2017 and 2018 for gassing its own people. If you want a Democratic example, Bill Clinton didn’t start a war when he struck Iraq in 1993 and 1998.

This amendment purports to tie the hands of the Commander in Chief relative only to a single nation, which I know many in the nation that just shot down an American aircraft. The only result that will come of this amendment passing will be to embolden the Ayatollahs and make more likely that which its proponents wish to avoid.

I urge all of my colleagues to see the reality of this amendment and to vote no tomorrow morning.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINES. Madam President, I rise to speak in favor of the Udall amendment, a bipartisan amendment. I am a proud Virginian. The Commonwealth of Virginia is more connected to the Navy Yard and military services, by the installations in Virginia, and by personnel than any other State, and I am the proud father of a U.S. marine. I love serving with my colleagues on the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees.

Tomorrow we are going to vote on a question that cannot be more fundamental: Can President Trump take us to war with Iran without coming to Congress for authorization? That is the question. Can President Trump take us to war with Iran without coming to Congress for authorization? This is a matter of the utmost importance for this body, for the American public, and for our troops. Americans, especially those who have family serving in the military—and many of those families have seen their loved ones deployed multiple times since 2001—want to know what each Senator thinks about this important question.

The Udall amendment to the NDAA, which has bipartisan sponsorship, is very simple. It states that no funds will be expended in a war with Iran or on Iranian soil, except in self-defense, unless Congress takes the affirmative step of specifically authorizing those hostilities.

My colleague from Arkansas talked about lawyers dancing on the head of a pin, as he tried to suggest that “self-defense” was not a clearly defined term. I think most of my colleagues would read the language will believe it is incredibly clear; the President has the power to defend the Nation from an imminent attack or ongoing attack without asking anyone for permission. That is specifically stated in our resolution. There is no confusion about it. There is no war with Iran without the President’s power to defend the Nation, but if the President decides that we need to go on an offensive war against a sovereign country, this amendment would suggest he could not do so unless he came to Congress.

Those voting for this amendment will say clearly that no war should be started unless Congress votes for it. Those
Why is this debate important right now? We are in the middle of discussing the National Defense Authorizing Act, but I also want to point out two very important things, one an event and one a statement that may have occurred in the last week, since many of us took the floor last Wednesday.

On Thursday, a week ago today, President Trump ordered and then called off a missile strike against Iranian territory that would have been the start of a shooting war with Iran. It was a calculated strike in the sovereign nation of Iran. Our military and all reasonable people understood that would have been responded to. So we were within 10 minutes, President Trump says he called off the strike on Iran with 10 minutes to spare.

We were within 10 minutes a week ago of being in a war.

The second thing that happened is, a few days ago, the President gave an exclusive interview to The Hill saying: "I do not need congressional approval to strike Iran." Congress is irrelevant. I don’t need to come to Congress.

The quote that the Democratic leader mentioned a few minutes earlier was that this President is so proud to keep them abreast of the situation, but I am not legally required to do so.

How insulting for the President, who pledged at his inauguration to defend and support the Constitution, to not have to come to Congress or the legislative body, make the decision, defend the decision, and not the article I branch for a reason—must not be just consulted with but be on board with any wars expressed by their vote.

This President is holding the article I branch in contempt. Will we grovel and accept that monumental disrespect or will we insist that the President must follow the law?

For the record, I believe a war with Iran would be a colossal mistake. Its consequences would be catastrophic. It is incumbent upon the President and Congress to consider the consequences of the decisions they make, particularly the President. It is incumbent upon the President to consult with Congress and educate them why war is necessary—and especially, and most importantly, the debate and the vote by the legislative body is the evidence of support for the mission that American troops deserve if they are going to be sent into harm’s way where they could be killed or injured or see their friends killed or injured.

I believe it is the height of public immorality. There could be nothing more immoral than that. This provision does say that if we are going to go to war with Iran and, with any nation, Congress should have the guts and backbone to come and cast a vote before we order our troops into harm’s way.

I am proud to partner with Senators Kaine, Paul, Merkley, Durbin, Murphy, and Lee in this effort and to call
upon Congress to meet its constitutional responsibilities. After years of abdicating our responsibilities on matters of war, this entire body must stand up and show that we will not roll over for an unauthorized, unconstitutional war, or support this amendment.

This dangerous course with Iran began last May when the President unilaterally withdrew from the Iran nuclear agreement. This hard-fought diplomatic achievement denied Iran the nuclear material required to even begin work on a nuclear weapon. Since this administration turned away from diplomacy and resorted to a maximum pressure campaign to box in Iran, the risk of war has steadily risen.

Just last week, we were 30 minutes away from a strike on Iran, 10 minutes from a nightmare of escalation in the Gulf. This week, the President threatened Iran. I am quoting his words here—these are pretty strong words—he said to Iran: I threaten them with "greater, overwhelming force," and he used the word "obliteration." That is not diplomacy; that is a drumbeat toward war without congressional approval.

Tensions are the highest they have been in many years, and the risk of a costly miscalculation grows day by day. Just days ago, the President falsely claimed he does not need congressional approval to launch strikes against Iran. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution could not be clearer: It vests the power to declare war with Congress. It vests the power to declare war, not the President.

The administration has reimposed and tightened sanctions on Iran three times—sanctions we agreed not to impose if Iran agreed not to develop nuclear capabilities.

The Founders weighed in time and exclusively vested in the legislature the power of judging the causes of war, is fully embedded in our Constitution. In Article I, section 8, under the enumerated powers of Congress, are simply the words "to declare war." That power is vested in Congress, not the President.

The Founders weighed in time and again about this. Turning to James Madison, the father of the Constitution, he commented:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most in danger in war, and most partial to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war to the Legislature.

He went on:

The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully vested in Congress, not the President.

Madison continues:

The executive has no right, in any case, to decide the question, whether there is or not cause for declaring war.

He was the father of our Constitution. That led to this document that vests the power to declare war with Congress, not the President.

George Washington, the father of our Nation, said: "The constitution vests..."
the power of declaring war in Congress; therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure.”

This was the Commander in Chief speaking as the hero of the American Revolution speaking. This was the man most trusted to be the first President of the United States, who was to steer the course and make sure the Presidency did not become a kingship, his conclusion?

“(Therefore, no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have . . . authorized such a measure.”

This is enormously at odds with the vision our colleague from Arkansas presented on the floor—dismissing the role of Congress, dismissing the Constitution, and instead saying let the President, as Commander in Chief, do what he will. That was not the vision. George Washington, as you stand in DC, you can look across the Potomac River, and you can see a monument to George Mason. He made notes of the Constitutional Convention. George Mason remarked that he was “against giving the power of war to the President” because the President “is not safely to be trusted with it.” That was the point, that no one individual, no matter how wise—not even a George Washington—could be trusted with this decision. George Washington, as President, with this completely, that despite his expertise as a Commander in Chief, it was not to be the judgment of one person.

James Madison, one of the most brilliant minds our country has ever produced, commented: “We have already given in example”—referring to the Constitution—“one effective check to the dog of war by transferring the power of letting him”—the dog of war—“loose from the Executive to the Legislative.” So he is commenting on the Constitution and saying: We have put a check on the dog of war by putting that power in the legislative body, not the executive.

Jefferson became President. Did he change his mind when he became President? His initial quote I gave you was from 1789, but later he became President of the United States. And what did he think then? He thought the same exact thing, just as President, as President, Jefferson said: “Considering that Congress alone is constitutionally invested with the power of changing our condition from peace to war, I have thought it my duty to await their authority for using force in any degree which could be avoided”—his predecessor to Congress is explicit. He recognized what the Constitution did. Are we going to recognize the constitutional vision? No, there may be folks in this Chamber who simply disagree with the Founders and say that Congress is too complicated, that the power to declare war and the power to go to war should be vested solely in the Commander in Chief. Well, then, come and present a constitutional amendment on the floor of the U.S. Senate. You took an oath to the Constitution of the United States, and that oath says that power rests in this body.

If you want to change the Constitution, then pay your dues. The Constitution is not a dogma. And when we have Secretary of State downwards to say that no one has ever stood up to Iran and we have to do something and we have Secretary of State who says that we have to do something, we will consider that effect, and we have a President who has proceeded to say that any attack will be met by great and overwhelming force.

So envision these preplaced forces. And, in fact, the President has declared that a section of the Iranian military, the Revolutionary Guard is a terrorist force. Add all of that up, and the President is talking about looking for a trigger to apply great and overwhelming force. That is why we are here. A response in proportion to defend a direct attack on the United States is authorized by the War Powers Act. But is it honored by the resolution that is before us, the Udall-Paul-Kaine amendment that is before us. That is honored. But as for the use of great and overwhelming force the President is threatening, that is war. That has to confront this body.

The President went on and said: “In some areas, overwhelming will mean obliteration.” So for any attack? And we have heard the Secretary of State say if there is a Shiite force in Iraq that is held down by the revolution, and some communication, we will consider that an attack by Iran—looking for a trigger to go to war. And the President has said any act will be met with overwhelming force.

Not under our Constitution. You want that authority? You come here. You want to change the Constitution? Then, come here. I say this to my fellow Senators: Do you want to change the Constitution? Bring your amendment and present it to the Senate to change the Constitution.

The Constitution speaks clearly. The President has no authority to apply overwhelming force or obliterating force and conduct a war against Iran. Make your case here or honor the Constitution.

We are in a troubling and difficult time, and I would like to see every Member of the Senate down here talking to each other about this. That is the authority of the body of the Members. It is not a few Members who are here to stand up for our Constitution and the vision of wisdom in our Constitution. This is the time, before there is that trigger in which the President responds with great and overwhelming force and before he responds with obliterating force. Now is the time to pass this amendment put together in a bipartisan fashion that lays out the fundamental requirements of our Constitution and the fundamental requirements that we have repeated and honored by the greatest Presidents who have ever served our Nation.
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Let us not allow the vision of our Constitution to be shredded. Let us honor our responsibility when we took an oath in office to defend it, and let us honor the wisdom of holding that debate on the floor, should the President ever ask us for such authorization to go to war against Iran.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

MILITARY WIDOW’S TAX ELIMINATION ACT

Mr. JONES. Madam President, I approach to say how much I appreciate my colleagues, Senator MERKLEY and Senator KAIN, for their eloquent thoughts on an important issue of our time.

Let me also now rise in total frustration on a completely different issue—but total frustration, bafflement, and, quite frankly, just angry and disappointed in this body. I am angry because we have turned our back for over 40 years on military families. We have turned our backs on the widows of the very men and women who have given their lives to protect this country, to uphold our democratic ideals, and to make possible the very work that we are doing in the Senate and the very work that we, as Members of the Senate and as Members of Congress, are charged to do every day on behalf of the American people and, particularly, on behalf of veterans and their families.

I am talking about this body’s refusal to bring up the Military Widow’s Tax Elimination Act—the refusal to bring it up for a single floor vote—despite the fact that we have 75 cosponsors—75 cosponsors of this bill. It is the most bipartisan legislation, except for the robocall bill, which everybody says is the most bipartisan legislation, except for the robocall bill, which everybody could agree on. And we can’t get that to a vote in this body?

Where have we gone wrong? Where have the rules of the body—the rules that we, as Members of the Senate and as Members of Congress, are operating under—gone off the rails that we can’t bring this to a vote, to just get a simple up-or-down vote, on a process that is ripe, and that is the NDAA?

In my 17 or 18 months—I forget how many now in this body—I have had some frustrating moments, as I know all of my colleagues who have been here for a long time have had a lot of frustrating moments. We have shut down government three times since I have been a U.S. Senator—three times. I have seen disaster relief held up for 5 or 6 months, with farmers and others needing that relief, needing that money, needing that help, and we held it up for political reasons so that someone can score a point, because everything is seen through the eyes of a political gamesmanship. That is how we are operating today, and it is incredibly frustrating for those of us who want to make sure we go forward with things we see bipartisan efforts.

In this situation, we are talking about military families who are getting ripped off by us. You can call it the government if you want to, but at the end of the day, they are getting ripped off by every single Member of this body and the House of Representatives, and they have had it. It is no wonder that the American people think that Congress and Washington, in general, is just broken. If we can’t fight for military widows and spouses, who are having their survivor benefits shortchanged, then, for whom are we going to fight? For whom are we going to stand up?

We always talk about standing up for the least of these. I have people wanting to stand up for the immigrants coming across the border. I have people wanting to stand up for corporations and to make sure that they are paying their share of the taxes, as opposed to overburden. I have people standing up for people every day, but here we have a chance to stand up for people who have given their lives for this country, and we are not doing it. We are not doing it.

If we can’t do the right thing on this, with 75 cosponsors, how can we possibly tackle immigration reform? How can we possibly tackle healthcare reform or education in this country if we can’t do something—simple agreement on one simple vote when we have 75 cosponsors?

How can we not fight for people like Cathy Milford, a retired schoolteacher from Mobile, AL, whose husband passed away from a service-connected illness just months after his retirement from the Coast Guard? Instead of a long and happy retirement together, Cathy has been fighting to right this wrong for all of the some 65,000 military spouses who are hurt by the current law.

During a recent visit here to Capitol Hill, she said: “Every time I talk about this”—and she is up here a lot talking about this issue. That is not only about her—Cathy, her family, her children, her parents, her husband and all over again.”

Just think about that. Let that just sink in for a minute: a military widow, one of many thousands, one of many thousands, who are fighting to right this wrong for all of the some 65,000 military spouses who are hurt by the current law.

We have tried to pass this legislation. The Senate has, in some form or education in this country if we can’t do the right thing on this. We have tried to pass this legislation. The Senate has, in some form or education in this country if we can’t do the right thing on this.

Let me repeat that critical phrase today: . . . to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan.”

This is the promise we have made to those who raise their hand in service to our Nation. This is the contract, the solemn contract, that we have made to the American people. We are the ones. We are the ones. We are the only people they can turn to. This can’t be fixed on the streets. It can’t be fixed at the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans’ Affairs or the legislature. The Congress of the United States, is the only one that can do it, and we are the ones who should be fighting for these military spouses, the widows and widowers whose loved ones gave their lives for this country, the widows and widowers whose lives are forever changed because of their family’s selfless service to this country.

Caring for military families has long been part of the foundation of our government. In President Abraham Lincoln’s second inaugural address, he spoke in no uncertain terms about this obligation. In the midst of the Civil War, he addressed a nation that had sustained unimaginable loss—imaginary loss—imaginary loss—in order to preserve the Union we so cherish.

The country was then more divided than it ever had been, and God help us if it ever gets that divided again, but the values Lincoln asserted during that speech were so fundamental that, even at war with itself, it could agree on the importance.

He said this:

With malice toward none, with charity for all, in sincerity, . . . the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation’s wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan.”
President Lincoln was assassinated just over a month after he issued this appeal, but the weight of his words still resonate today. In some ways, on this issue, they resonate more because in those days you could count on the fact that the legislative body, the Congress of the United States, heeded these words and took care of those families.

It has been 154 years since President Lincoln spoke those words; yet the Government of the United States, the Members of this body, the Members of the House have yet to fulfill that promise. It has been 154 years, and we still get caught up in the deals that are made as to what gets on the floor and what does not get on the floor, the political deals that have to be jockeyed, where we give and take, and it is one over the other. We need to fix that today.

We need to fix it in a broader sense and let this body get back to its real work and be the great deliberative body it is supposed to be. We are not doing that, but that is a different issue for a different time.

Let’s start today and stand up and exhibit just a fraction, a small fraction—a small, small fraction—of the courage that these military spouses did on our behalf. Let’s let our actions speak louder than words simply ever could. Let’s put the issue to rest and give these widows some peace.

Let us do our duty.

It was Atticus Finch, who told the jury in “To Kill a Mockingbird,” as he closed out, knowing what the outcome was going to be, as I do here—knowing what the outcome was going to be, it was Atticus Finch, who said: “In the name of God, do your duty.”

I say that to this body. I say that to the leadership. In the name of God, let’s do our duty to these people. Let’s get behind the political deals and let’s do our duty, once and for all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to set aside the pending amendment; that amendment No. 269 be considered and agreed to; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to set aside the pending amendment; that amendment No. 269 be considered and agreed to; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, reserving the right, let me share a story of something that happened.

The timing sometimes happens at very inconvenient times, but on September 7, 2011, I was in my home state of Oklahoma and was in Collinsville, OK. Probably not many people have been to Collinsville, OK, but I have. It was the home of a really beloved individual and family. The family was the Chris Horton family, and the wife was Jane Horton.

I remember it so well. This was September 7, 2011. I was talking to the group, and I was telling them that I was preparing to make one of my regular trips to Afghanistan. At that time, I was not chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, but I was a high-ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In the audience was Jane Horton, and Jane said: Well, if you are going to go over there, why don’t you go by and see my husband, Chris? I said: I will do it. I found out where his whereabouts, exactly where he was. I got over there to look up Chris, only to find out that 2 days before that Chris was killed in Collinsville, OK, that Chris died in action. Chris died in action. I was the one who had to call on and share that with his wife, Jane Horton.

In fact, after that, we hired Jane to go around and help us with the widows’ benefits. Starting at that time, I was the leader and continued to be a leader long before the Senator from Alabama was into this, and he will agree that I was actively working on this issue.

I say that to this body. I say that to support the permanent fix. It is going to happen. We are going to do it. In fact, I am the first Senate Armed Services chairman to cosponsor this legislation.

Mr. JONES mentioned there were 75 people who cosponsored it. That is I. I was on there on the initial legislation and will continue to be and will always be, and that reflects my commitment to the permanent fix.

Here is the problem we have. There has to be a fix, but it can’t be on this bill. The reason it can’t be on this bill is because it has a mandatory spending that has no offset, and there is not an exception to this on the bill. This is part of the agreement in bringing the bill up.

Now, what we can do is go ahead and do what is necessary with this very popular cause, and I will be standing with the Senator from Alabama to make sure this happens.

Let’s assume that is not true, that we couldn’t do it under the rules. Under the rules, there is another rule that if there is an objection to any amendments coming up, then I, as the chairman of the committee, if the party obj ecting is not here, I have to offer his objection.

There is an objection to this, and I will therefore object and be in the strongest position of helping this to become a reality. I owe it not just to the many people I know but also to the family whom I just referred to from Collinsville.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES. I thank my friend and colleague, the Chairman INHOFE, and let me say I know where he has been on this issue. I have seen his speeches from years past on this issue, and I do appreciate that, and I appreciate the fact that he is committed.

I also know that he has been put on an NDAA before in this body without a pay-for, without an offset, in order to have a sense of the Senate and to go on record, and that is what I think we should do. I understand we are not there this year for whatever reason. I still believe, in part, that it is a procedural issue that ought to be put aside for this, but that is an argument for another day.

I do so very much appreciate the chairman’s remarks. I have enjoyed working with him, Senator REED, and others on the NDAA. That has been an effort. I told folks back home and across the country where I have spoken that we have actually seen what happened in that markup behind closed doors and the bipartisan-ship that the chairman showed and the other Senators showed. I wish people could have seen it because we don’t get to see it. I don’t think if we opened it up that we would have seen it, but it was remarkable.

So we are where we are in the Senate. I understand that, and I knew that coming in here. I will simply say this. The Senate of Representatives is also going to take up the NDAA, and I hope my colleagues on the other side of the wonderful Capitol are listening. Put it in. It is not in the committee bill. Put it in. Bring it to conference because, if it gets to conference, I am going to continue to have this in this NDAA, and let’s get this done, once and for all.

Thank you, Chairman INHOFE, and thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if I might, let me describe where things are in the state of play with respect to the supplemental appropriations bill that deals with the border.

I know the situation at our border has been at a crisis point for weeks now. Our agencies are stretched to the breaking point, straining for the overwhelming flow of migrants; yet we have House Democrats continuing to play politics with the border funding bill.

Again, to describe the state of play, we had a request from the President 7 weeks ago for $4.5 billion to address this humanitarian crisis we are having at our southern border, and the Demo- crats didn’t act on it. They described it as a manufactured crisis. When I say the Democrats, I am talking about the House Democrats, which is where most spending bills originate.

After the House failed to act and failed to respond to the President’s request for emergency funding, the Senate decided to act. So the Senate Appropriations Committee took up and passed a bipartisan bill out of the Appropriations Committee by a vote of 30 to 1—not a vote that you see all that often around here these days.

So that bill was reported out to the floor. In the meantime, the House Democrats decided that maybe it wasn’t, after all, a manufactured crisis and perhaps they needed to act. So
they picked up a bill—a partisan bill—and passed it out of the House of Representatives on a party-line basis, after which the Senate voted on its bill, the bill I mentioned that was reported out of the Appropriations Committee yesterday by a vote of 84 to 8 in the U.S. Senate.

Well, just to demonstrate that the bipartisan bill passed by the Senate is the vehicle that should move forward and should go to the President for his signature, the President had indicated he was going to sign the House-passed bill, but we took it up. We took up the House-passed bill yesterday on the floor of the U.S. Senate. We had a vote on it. It got 37 votes here on the floor of the Senate—not nearly enough, obviously, to pass the Senate. Of course, it was going to meet a certain veto by the President even if it had.

That being said, there were 37 votes for the House-passed partisan bill that came out of the House of Representatives. Here on the floor of the Senate, there were 84 votes for the bipartisan bill produced by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Where we are right now is that was sent back to the House. The House, frankly, should just take up that bill and pass it. We know for certain the President would sign it. Again, I think it demonstrates a body of work that re- flects the will of both sides, Republicans and Democrats—certainly in the Senate—to get a vote of 30 to 1 out of the Appropriations Committee or 84 to 8 on the floor of the Senate. You had to have a high level of bipartisan cooperation.

That bill to address the humanitarian crisis at our border is awaiting action by the House of Representatives. All they have to do is simply pick it up and pass it and send it to the President, where it will be signed into law, and we will get much needed resources to the southern border, where they desperately need it. I hope that will be the case.

We are being told that the House is now considering sending yet another partisan bill over here to the Senate. The only thing I can tell you is, if you want to get legislation signed into law by the President of the United States that actually does deliver and put the much needed assistance on the ground that is desperately needed on the southern border, the only surefire way to do that right now is for the House to pick up the Senate-passed bill, which passed here with 84 votes, pass it, and send it to the President, where it will be signed into law, and that $4.5 billion will be on its way to the border to assist with all the needs down there that are currently being unmet. I hope that can happen yet today.

That is the state of play with respect to the supplemental appropriations bill.
Margaret Thatcher once said that the problem with socialism is that eventually you run out of other people's money. Once Democrats have taken every dollar they can from the rich to pay for their socialist fantasies, they will come after the paychecks of ordinary working families and higher taxes for fewer and fewer benefits and greatly reduced choices. Democrats' socialist dreams would quickly trap the American people in a nightmare.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, before I deliver comments on a bill that I am introducing, let me express my disappointment that the Senate will not be voting today on the amendment that Senator Jones and I have filed to eliminate the military widow's tax.

This is a tremendous inequity, as is evidenced by the fact that 15 of our colleagues have cosponsored our free-standing bill.

Nevertheless, I am heartened by the commitment and the compassion of the Senate Armed Services Committee chairman, Senator Inhofe, who has in Senate Armed Services Committee commitment and the compassion of the colleagues have cosponsored our free-standing bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be received and appropriately referred.

(The remarks of Ms. Collins pertaining to the introduction of S. 2018 are printed in today's Record under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mrs. Murray pertaining to the introduction of S. 2006 are printed in today's Record under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to explain the context in which I will vote for the Romney amendment.

First, I am grateful for Senator Romney's substantive contributions and his collegiality as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The plain text of the amendment states the obvious—that funds authorized by the NDAA may be used to ensure that our Armed Forces must have the ability to defend themselves and our citizens against foreign enemies. Indeed, the purpose of the NDAA is to provide the authorizations that are necessary to ensure the Department of Defense is in a position to defend the United States and our citizens.

In my opinion, in that respect, this amendment is not necessary. For anyone who argues that the Romney language is somehow necessary because of the Romney amendment will be voting on tomorrow, I say reread the Udall amendment. It includes an explicit exception for self-defense.

I am concerned that this administration will seek to twist the Romney amendment into something that is completely unrecognizable, something that we are not voting on today, and something that has no basis in law. As a legal matter, the amendment does nothing more than to explicitly provide the authority to use funds under the act to ensure this ability.

Let me be clear. This amendment does nothing more than that. Either implicitly or explicitly, it does not authorize the use of military force. Let me repeat what the AUMF says. An explicit authorization would have to come to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee following serious and substantive engagement by the executive branch.

It is no secret that there are some in this administration who are eager to engage militarily with Iran. This week, the President himself argued that he does not have to go to Congress to seek authorization. But those who don't want to completely bypass our congressional prerogative will be grasping at any purported source of authority that could justify, in their minds, that Congress has authorized these actions.

Look no further than the Secretary of State, who is purportedly pushing the bogus legal theory that the 2001 AUMF, which Congress passed in the wake of 9/11, somehow provides authority to use force against Iran. Apparently, Secretary Pompeo is not dissuaded by the facts. The plain language of the 2001 AUMF does not extend to Iran. Congress did not intend for the 2001 AUMF to cover Iran, and neither Republican nor Democratic Presidents who have operated pursuant to this AUMF have claimed such authority.

Against this backdrop and a President who has evaded Congress in unprecedented and unlawful ways, we must make crystal clear that the Romney amendment cannot be abused by those in this administration who appear to be desperate to build a case that the President has all of the authority he needs to take us into war with Iran. We cannot leave anything up to chance when it comes to the choice of whether we send our sons and daughters into war. I believe we should have a serious conversation about our use of military force and about what constitutes self-defense and attacks on our allies.

I am pleased that the chair of the Foreign Relations Committee has previously committed to holding these hearings, and I believe we should come together with hearings with multiple stakeholders, including the administration itself. Previous administrations have sent up representatives to explain to Congress their rationale for war or to explain the type of authorizations they are seeking. We should demand nothing less from this administration.

I support the amendment, and I look forward to continuing appropriate oversight over the executive branch's pursuit of military action around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I thank my esteemed friend and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee for his kind words in support of my amendment.

As we debate the Defense Authorization Act today, one of our most pressing concerns is how we deter Iran from escalating its aggression. The decisions we make on this bill will have a direct bearing on the options the President and the military have available to keep our military, our citizens, and our friends and allies safe.

The Senate is poised to vote soon on my amendment, No. 861. It would reaffirm what has long been American policy. Our military is authorized to defend itself and to protect our citizens. Enacting this amendment makes it clear to our military, as well as to any potential adversary, that America does not shrink in the face of attack. This is not an authorization to use military force against Iran or anyone else; it is a statement of continued commitment to our national defense.

Under the Constitution, only Congress may declare war, but also under the Constitution, the President can defend against attacks and can respond in an appropriate manner to an attack that has been made.

As we all know, my esteemed colleague from New Mexico, Senator Udall, has proposed an amendment on a related topic which I wish to briefly address.

We do not need the Udall amendment to tell us what the administration already demands—that Congress alone can declare war. His amendment is clearly intended to limit the President in some other ways that he has not yet explained to this body.

As it is written, the Udall amendment would dramatically limit the existing authority that the Constitution provides to the President to respond to Iran. It would prevent the President
from defending U.S. citizens, U.S. interests, and our allies. This is not only my opinion; it is the carefully considered conclusion of the U.S. Department of Defense.

In its letter on June 26 to Chairman Inhofe, it states this, referring to the Udall amendment: “The Department strongly opposes this amendment... At a time when Iran is engaging in escalating military provocation, this amendment could embolden Iran to further provocations.”

Tying the President’s hands in some undefined way in the midst of the current crisis is misguided, dangerous, and surely sends the wrong message to both Iran and to our allies.

Last week, the Iranians continued their provocative escalation in the Middle East. After weeks of buildup in which Iran attacked six commercial ships, and its proxies bombed an oil pipeline and launched a rocket into a commercial Saudi Arabian airport, Iran shot down an American drone over international waters.

The Udall amendment raises serious questions about how the military could respond to these attacks after the fact. Could we fire on a missile launcher that downed our drone? Could we think one of their small, outboard motor vessels that attached the mines to the ships that were attacked?

Imagine for a moment that in the future, another American aircraft, perhaps one that is manned by an American pilot, were to be shot down by an Iranian rocket. It is possible that the Udall amendment would limit our military’s options to subsequently respond to such an outrage. I don’t pretend to know whether Iran will continue its pattern of aggression, but I do know that when bad actors think they can escape consequence for malevolent acts, such acts are more likely to occur in the future.

I am glad that Senator Udall’s revised amendment concedes the broad point that our military has the inherent right of self-defense. But in the case of a rocket hitting one of our planes, the President should not have his hands tied in responding after such an attack in an appropriate manner.

Note also that while the Udall amendment provides for the military to defend itself from attack, it does not provide for the defense of our citizens. Iran may take this as an invitation to attack Americans abroad.

Further, it would prohibit our military from defending or responding to an attack by Iran on our Iraqi partners so long as it didn’t directly hit American troops. Passing the Udall amendment would effectively give a green light to Iranian forces to carry out attacks in Iraq so long as they don’t attack U.S. forces.

If Iran were to attack Israel, one of our NATO allies, the Udall amendment would not allow the President to respond.

Finally, by carving out Iranian territory, the Udall amendment would potentially prevent us from pursuing and taking out terrorists who seek refuge in Iran.

I oppose the Udall amendment not because I want to go to war with Iran or rush to respond without carefully evaluating our long-term strategy to counter Iranian aggression, but I do know no one who wants to go to war with Iran.

I fully concur with my many Senate colleagues who desire to reassert the constitutional role of Congress in declaring war. But to engage in this effort now and in an undefined way, and then to attach that to Iran when Iran has just shot down an American aircraft would send a terrible message to the Ayatollahs and to the world.

I mean, think about it. Iran shoots down an American aircraft, and what does the U.S. Senate rush to do? It rushes to vote in some undefined way to restrict military consequence. That is simply unthinkable.

My amendment is not about Iran. It does not even mention Iran. My amendment is about affirming the constitutional authorities that any President must have to properly protect and defend this Nation.

As the Department of Defense maintains, the President of the United States must always have the option of responding to attacks by Iran or anyone else at a time and place of our choosing—today and in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 861, as modified, 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. By unanimous consent, the order that amendment No. 861, as modified, 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, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are necessary.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessary absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Rounds).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAASSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 7, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 186 Leg.)

YEAS—87

Alexander   Peakein
Balduin      Peters
Bass         Portman
Blackburn    Reed
Borks        Risch
Braxton      Roberts
Brown        Ronson
Burr         Schweicker
Capito       Schumer
Cardin       Scott (FL)
Carder       Scott (R)
Carter       Johnson
Caysey       Shelby
Cassy        Sinema
Cleary       Smith
Coons        Stabenow
Coraxyn      Sullivan
Corker Maste  Tester
Cotton       Thune
Cramer        Tills
Cru           Toone
Crus          Udall
Daines        Van Hohen
Duckworth     Warner
Durbin        Whitehouse
Rini          Wicker
Renn          Young

NAYS—7

Booker       Wyden
Klobuch    Merkley
Lee           Paul

NOT VOTING—6

Bennet        Sanders
Gilibrand     Rounds
Rounds        Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 7.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

AMENDMENT NOS. 861, 863, AND 862 WITHDRAWN

Under the previous order, amendment Nos. 861, 863, and 862 are withdrawn.

The Democratic leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 861

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes, equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am voting in favor of the Romney amendment, No. 861, because it does nothing more than restore the longstanding principle that the Armed Forces of the United States have the ability to defend themselves and citizens of the United States from foreign attack. The
amendment does not constitute an authorization to use military force, nor is there anything in the amendment that confers any new authority on the President.

As Senator ROMNEY, the author of the amendment, stated on the floor a half-hour ago, this amendment is not an authorization to use military force against Iran or anyone else. . . . Under the Constitution, only Congress may declare war.17 I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I will reassert the same thing I just heard from the minority leader. I appreciate his words.

This amendment would reaffirm a basic principle. The United States has the right to defend itself and our citizens when attacked. It asserts what has always been a bedrock constitutional principle. This is not an AUMP. It is not an authorization for the use of military force.

Passing my amendment today would send a strong signal to our adversaries that we will defend ourselves if our interests, our people, our military, our allies are threatened and attacked.

My amendment is something that I believe everyone in this body can and should support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the motion to recommit the amendment does not constitute an authorization to use military force, nor is there anything in the amendment that confers any new authority on the President. 

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak for 5 minutes on the NDAA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (No. 861) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 861) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes on the NDAA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1790

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the importance of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 legislation that authorizes $750 billion for defense, consistent with the administration’s budget request and the National Defense Strategy Commission report.

The NDAA is a critical piece of legislation. It supports our Armed Forces, our men and women in uniform, and provides for the defense of our Nation. Among its notable provisions, the bill supports a 3.1-percent pay increase for the members of our armed services, the largest in nearly a decade and very much deserved by the men and women in uniform who protect us.

It establishes a Space Force and ensures that America retains its leadership in this critical domain. It opens the way for significant investments in our defense weapons systems, such as hypersonic missiles and directed energy weapons along with missile defense and cyber security capabilities. It also responds to concerns about family housing across the Department of Defense.

It provides for the modernization of our nuclear forces. This legislation fully authorizes fiscal year 2020 spending on our nuclear deterrent, including support for all three legs of the Nation’s nuclear triad. It also fully authorizes the warhead life extension programs at the Department of Energy.

I want to highlight a couple of amendments I worked on and are included in the legislation relative to modernizing our nuclear triad. One of the amendments I worked on and is included requires that the Air Force and the National Nuclear Security Administration report to Congress on the development of the next intercontinental ballistic missile and the W87-1, which is a modified warhead that will be placed on the new ICBM for decades to come.

It is vital that the Air Force’s missile defense program, known as the Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent, GBSD, be synchronized with the W87-1 warhead so that a decade from now, we have a complete new weapons system that is ready for deployment. My amendment will help ensure that the deployment will happen on schedule and avoid unnecessary delays in that development.

The other amendment highlights the importance of our nation’s ICBM force and demonstrates how ICBMs enhance deterrence as a part of the triad. ICBMs provide the most prompt and most dispersed segment of our nuclear forces, and they magnify the deterrent power of our nuclear triad.

I commend my colleagues for their support of these amendments, which is a strong statement of the continuing importance of the ICBM and the need to ensure that it is modernized along with the rest of our nuclear forces in order to keep us safe.

The bill is also critically important for military activities in my home State of North Dakota. Specifically, we worked to secure a number of provisions to support the missions at the Minot Air Force Base, which is home to two of the three legs of the nuclear triad. Importantly, the NDAA authorizes funding for B-52s, including the procurement of new engines. As a member of the Senate Defense Appropriations Committee, I have worked to authorize and appropriate money for new engines which will help modernize the B-52 and extend its life for years to come.

The NDAA also advances replacement of the Vietnam-era Huey helicopters that provide security for the missile fields, and it supports the construction of a new helicopter facility at Minot to house the fleet. It also makes a strong commitment to the Long-Range Stand Off, LRSO, Program that will provide a new nuclear cruise missile for the B-52, as well as continuing to advance the investments in GBSD.

The bill also supports priorities at Grand Forks Air Force Base, which is home to the Global Hawk, which provides important intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities for the Air Force. In fact, it was the Navy version of the Global Hawk which was recently shot down in the Strait of Hormuz by Iran.

This bill authorizes more than $240 million for the Global Hawk Program and more than $115 million for the Battlefront Airborne Communications Node that is carried on the Global Hawk Block 20 aircraft. These investments in the Global Hawk have been a priority because the Global Hawk BACN system is urgently needed to provide communications support for operations around the world.
Finally, I would like to emphasize support for items that some of my colleagues put forward that I think are critically important both for my State and for the Nation as a whole. I am pleased to cosponsor an amendment from Senator GRAHAM that commits us over the next decade to building our capacity to produce plutonium pits. We must build up this capacity so we can extend the life of our nuclear stockpile and preserve our nuclear deterrent in the future. I also cosponsored an amendment from Senator MURKOWSKI that requires the Defense Department to report on Russian and Chinese activities in the Arctic, which is an area of the world where we need to build up our capabilities in the coming years.

I would similarly express my support for Senator HAWLEY’s amendment that requires a report from our military commanders on their ability to deter aggressive actions from Russia and China. This amendment can be included on this legislation as well.

The bill also includes an important provision from Senator KLOBUCHAR that I cosponsored to help ensure that the children of National Guard and Reserve members have access to additional support services in schools. I cosponsored a provision from Senator BALDWIN, who joins me on the floor today, that will protect veterans’ benefits if and when they have to file for bankruptcy. I am pleased to cosponsor her amendment.

All of these items demonstrate just what a large undertaking the National Defense Authorization Act really is. It includes thousands of provisions and represents a lot of work from many Members in support of our military servicemembers and their families.

I look forward to passing the legislation today and moving it to conference and getting it enacted into law for our men and women in uniform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

FOURTH OF JULY

MRS. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I am so grateful we had the opportunity to be on the floor this week and to have a discussion about our Nation’s security and how we protect and preserve freedom. I have just a couple of thoughts that I wanted to bring forward. I think about July 4th and Independence Day and how we commemorate that day and do honor to the heritage and the tradition of that day and of the freedoms that we enjoy.

I came across something this week that I think is just so pertinent to our discussions of this week as we focus on freedom. In 1826, a very feeble and old John Adams received a group of Quin- cy, MA, town leaders. They were seeking his help in planning an anniversary celebration of the Declaration of Inde- pendence. They wanted the former President to pen a toast that would be read at the event. Imagine their sur-prise when what they got from John Adams was two words. The toast that he penned for them was simply this: “Independence forever.” It is what we had fought for, what had been won, what people had desired, and their pas- sion—that is what we had fought for.

Keeping that independence is indeed the task. I am certain they wanted something much more ambitious and eloquent, but they simply got the nugget of what centered him and what should center us.

In the Declaration, our Founding Fa-thers recognized that “Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes,” but that true liberty could not thrive in the grasp of tyranny.

Today, freedom reveals itself in the lives and actions of every American, and it is our responsibility to preserve it on the battlefield and through our actions each and every single day.

With every confirmation of a district or a circuit court judge, we preserve an essential right guaranteed by the First Amendment—the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Earlier this month, I introduced a resolution supporting free speech on college campuses because it is beyond distressing to hear students and their professors argue that encouraging the open exchange of ideas amounts to an act of violence. Our Founding Fathers probably never dreamed they would hear of such a thing. This profound hos-tility toward diversity of thought should serve as a reminder that ques-tions of freedom rarely remain settled.

Last week, famed economist Dr. Art Laffer, who is a beloved Tennessean, and his friend and fellow economist Art Laffer, who is a beloved Tennessean, was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom. The “father of supply-side economics” only became so because he was free to learn and apply the knowl-edge that he gained to his own groundbreaking work that led to the Laffer curve.

Looking beyond Washington, it is easy to see many more examples of freedom in action each and every day. Every Tuesday, my friend and fellow Senator, LAMAR ALEXANDER, hosts “Tennessee Tuesday.” This gives us an opportunity to meet with Tennesseans who have come to Washington. They are students, small businessmen, writ-ers, and teachers. They have a host of talents that they share, and they have been willing to use their talents.

Back home in Nashville, we enjoy the artistry of some of the world’s most talented songwriters, singers, and pro-ducers. Guess what? In the United States of America, they do not have to go seek permission from any govern-ment officials to write a song about a broken heart or any other act of injust-ice that they want to write that song about, sing that song about, or write that screenplay about.

The connection between what each other—whether it be through art, song, or a conversation at a cash register—all run deep. The thoughts and emo-tions we experience when confronted with provocative ideas are just as much a celebration of freedom as is a flag-raising ceremony or a fireworks display. This is why the very idea of censorship or a global standard of speech and association rouses imme-diately concern.

We know that these collective under-standings regarding a particular type of speech or behavior inevitably lead to collective insistence that the problems of the world could be resolved if only people could agree to compromise on the finer points of freedom. Those under-standings assume that the intellectual comfort of the many simply must, just this once, override the ideas of the vocal minority.

As we prepare to leave Washington in anticipation of Independence Day, I would encourage my friends in Con-gress to challenge their own ideas of what freedom looks like. How do they exercise it and enjoy it every day? While John Adams probably never thought of it, I could agree to compromise on the freedom of the press.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-ator from Wisconsin.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE STONEWALL UPRISING

MS. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to mark the 50th anniversary of a critical milestone in our Nation’s march toward equality—the Stonewall uprising of June 28, 1969.

The Stonewall Inn, which opened in 1967 on Christopher Street in Green-wich Village in New York City, was one of many establishments in cities across this country that served as sanctuaries for members of the LGBTQ community from persecution by police and by soci-ety at large. In the late 1960s, every State in America, save one, criminalized same-sex relationships. Many State and local governments also had harsh laws that restricted the ability of transgender people to express their identities, and LGBTQ people were prohibited from gathering socially. As a result, LGBTQ individuals in places like Stonewall Inn, where they gathered, were targeted frequently by law enforcement, including the New York City Police De-partment. However, LGBTQ people had already begun to stand up to police harassment, including at places like Cooper Do-nuts in Los Angeles in 1959, Compton’s Cafe-teria in San Francisco in 1966, and the Black Cat Tavern in Los Angeles in 1967.

In the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, the NYPD raided the Stonewall Inn and arrested several people, just as it had done repeatedly over the days, weeks, and months prior. But this night was different. A few brave indi-viduals—particularly trans gender women of color, like Marsha P. John-son and Sylvia Riviera—stood up and
fought back against this injustice. That night, they sparked an uprising against the NYPD with confrontations and protests at the Stonewall Inn and the surrounding area that lasted over the course of 6 days, until July 3, 1969. The Stonewall uprising empowered thousands of LGBTQ individuals to emerge from shadows and to come out publicly as they stood up for their community the night of June 28, 1969, and beyond, putting their lives and their safety at risk.

Alleged public protests in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Washington, DC, and elsewhere, the Stonewall uprising became a catalyst for the LGBTQ civil rights movement to secure social and political equality and inspired the formation of many advocacy organizations.

A year later, members of the LGBTQ community commemorated the first anniversary of Stonewall and reaffirmed their solidarity of the community by organizing the first Pride marches and events in New York City, San Francisco, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Now, we remember and celebrate the Stonewall uprising every year in June as Pride Month.

Three years ago, President Obama declared the Stonewall Inn and its surrounding area a national monument, becoming the first national monument to honor the LGBTQ civil rights movement.

Last month, New York City announced that it would dedicate a monument honoring pioneering transgender activists and key leaders in the Stonewall uprising, including Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera. It would be the first public monument in the world honoring transgender women.

Just a few weeks ago, the NYPD Command issued an official apology on behalf of the department stating: “The actions taken by the NYPD were wrong—plain and simple.”

I was just a kid when the Stonewall uprising happened. I didn’t hear about Stonewall on the news or even learn about it later in my history class. It wasn’t until I was in college when, as a part of my own coming out process, I began to research the history of the gay rights movement and I learned more about the events at Stonewall, the people involved, and the movement that it created.

Five years after Stonewall, in 1974, Kathy Kozachenko became the first openly gay person elected to political office in the United States, winning a seat on the Ann Arbor City Council in Michigan. Three years later, in 1977, Harvey Milk was elected to the San Francisco City Council.

In 1986, I had the honor of winning election to the Dane County Board. I was really fortunate to have role models who had come before me. In 1998, I became the first openly gay person elected to the U.S. House of Representatives as a nonincumbent, and, in 2012, I became the first out member of the LGBTQ community to be elected to the U.S. Senate in its history.

I remember my early years in public office when there were only about two dozen or so elected officials who were out across the country. We would meet on an annual basis to discuss how we could work together to exchange ideas about legislation that would advance equality, and we talked about how we would help to expand our numbers at the local, state, and national levels. I am proud to say that, today, there are more than 700 out LGBT people who are serving in elected office across the United States.

All of these public servants bring their lived life experiences to the job, and they give the LGBTQ community a seat at the table of our local, state, and Federal Governmental bodies. Perhaps just as importantly, each of these public servants is a role model for the next generation. This is important progress, but we are not there yet. We have more work to do, and we must keep fighting to move our country forward.

Members of the LGBTQ community continue to experience bias in policing and are still at significant risk of violence and discrimination. According to the annual hate crimes report, which is published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, LGBTQ individuals and, particularly, LGBT individuals of color continue to be the target of bias-motivated violence, but efforts to address this violence may be hindered by a continued lack of trust in law enforcement. At least 100 transgender people, making this legislation is foundational to their mission, their work, and our show of support for the military.

I thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED for their bipartisan leadership on the Senate Armed Services Committee and on the floor. The tremendous responsibility of providing for our men and women who serve our country in the Armed Forces. For decades, it has been approved with strong, bipartisan support.

In my home State of Colorado, our military installations, including Fort Carson, the Air Force Academy, and Buckley, Peterson, and Schriever Air Force Bases, are on the cutting edge of readiness in protecting our national security. This legislation is foundational to their mission, their work, and our show of support for the military.

I also thank my colleagues for their bipartisan work on the National Defense Authorization Act. In working with them, I was able to achieve a number of great victories in amendments for Colorado and the Nation as well.

Senator SCHATZ and I have a bipartisan amendment that will improve the public alert system and allow military communities access to clean and safe drinking water, which was another...
amendment that we were able to work on. I was able to work with Senator Toomey and Senator Van Hollen—Senators from both sides of the aisle—to impose sanctions on the murderous North Korean regime.

We will also vote today to support a bipartisan effort that I authored that will encourage the U.S. Congress to stand with the people of Hong Kong and their democratic values while we urge Hong Kong's authorities to permanently withdraw their flawed extradition bill and support human rights in Hong Kong.

When one family member serves our country in uniform, the entire family serves. This legislation supports military families in Colorado and all over the world. It provides the largest pay increase in a decade for troops, and it continues to support military spouses. The NDAA addresses the challenges that service members and their families face when they live in privatized housing, and it expands resources to address PFAS water contamination in many of our military communities. This is an issue of life and health, and it matters greatly to the people of Colorado. I was pleased to work with my colleagues to continue addressing PFAS contamination.

Of course, in Colorado, we are proud to play a very key role in defending the United States. These installations that I talked about are critical to national security and supporting our operations in space. I am thrilled that this year's NDAA authorizes the U.S. Space Force so that the United States can remain a global leader in space and not fall behind China or any other foreign competitor.

Almost everything in today's age relies on space technology—telecommunications, GPS, transportation logistics, precision agriculture, and, of course, the U.S. military. Establishing the U.S. Space Force will better organize the military to handle space operations and will put all military members who work in the space domain under the same organizational umbrella. Colorado is home to the North American Aerospace Defense Command and the U.S. Northern Command, and it is the legacy home of the Air Force Space Command. As we establish the U.S. Space Force, Colorado is uniquely positioned to support and lead our Nation's military operations in space and the mission set that space involves.

We cannot risk falling behind our foreign competitors in the second space age. In order to guarantee the safety and security of American citizens, we must maintain our leadership in space operations and defense. I urge my colleagues to support the National Defense Authorization Act, which supports operations across the globe and the brave women and men who serve in the U.S. military. I will always fight to protect and grow the presence of the U.S. military in Colorado and work to ensure that these bases, which are essential to both national security and Colorado communities, remain strong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the yeas and nays on the substitute amendment. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and Senator Jack Reed be given such time as we shall consume prior to the vote that will take place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in just a few minutes, the Senate will vote on the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

Throughout the last week and a half, we have debated the legislation here on the Senate floor in a fair process. I thank my colleagues who have supported this bill and have helped to make it better the amendment process. While I would have liked to have had more open amendments—and Senator Reed and I both wanted to have more amendments on the floor—we knew that there was a problem and that we would not have that.

We are pleased that we will at least be able to clear the 93 amendments that we added on yesterday as part of the bipartisan substitute amendment in the manager's package. These include the annual Intelligence Authorization Act, the Maritime Administration Authorization and Enhancement Act, and the Fentanyl Sanctions Act.

Ultimately, the job of the NDAA is to make tough choices about where we want to invest our resources. We put our forces where they matter—in taking care of our people, in implementing the national defense strategy, and in applying recommendations from the NDS Strategy Commission Report. This is something we have used as a blueprint, and it has been very successful in taking us through this process.

Everyone agrees there are things that are going to have to happen in order to rebuild our military. That is why our top line is $750 billion. Without that, we can't achieve the goals that we all know are necessary. It also must happen as soon as possible. We can't delay on this bill.

We still have more work to be done on the NDAA. We need to conference it. The Conference Committee can sometimes take a little bit of time. We know that is going to be done for us. We know that we want to get this thing done by our deadline, which would be October 1.

In the month of July, we have to do a lot of other things. We have to do annual appropriations bills. We have to do the budget deal. So these are some of our most important responsibilities.

We have to get them done, and here is why: Things are happening right now.

Two days ago, MSG Michael B. Riley of Helibronn, Germany, and SGT James G. Johnston of Trumansburg, NY, lost their lives in Afghanistan while engaged in combat operations. It was tragic.

Their service and sacrifice is a reminder of why this bill is so important. We have to make sure our troops have the very best of everything, and we are in the process of getting there with this bill.

Our prayers are with Master Sergeant Riley's and Sergeant Johnston's families and loved ones. We will never forget their service or their sacrifice that they made, reminding us that freedom is not free.

There is no doubt in my mind that the NDAA we are about to pass will give our troops what they need, make American families safer, and enable us to stand up for democratic values around the world.

Let me single out and thank publicly the next speaker, the ranking member, Senator Inhofe, for being a great partner in this. We stayed together on this. We had areas where we disagreed, but we got around those, we got things done, and the end result is a very good one.

I know Senator Reed is going to want to recognize, as I do, the significance of the staff we worked with and why that is so important. Of course, we want to make sure people know—you know, Senator Reed and I get a lot of credit for doing a lot of stuff that other people do. We truly appreciate these people.

Let me list some of them. First of all, John Bonsell and Liz King from my staff and from Senator Reed's staff. They are the ones who really got involved in this, and we, without them, it would have been almost impossible—along with other people.


I have a few more so just relax for a minute. I think the others are actually from the minority side, and I am sure Senator Reed is going to be recognizing them.

From my personal staff, Luke Holland, Andrew Forbes, Leacy Burke, Don Archer, Kyle Stewart, and Bryan Brody.

Lastly, from the floor staff, that is Laura Dove, Robert Duncan, Chris Tuck, Tony Hanagan, Katherine Kiley, Brian Canfield, Abigail Baker, and Megan Mercer.
I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 764, as modified and amended.

The amendment (No. 764), as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title for the third time.

The bill (S. 1790), as amended, was ordered to be reported from the Committee on Armed Services, to which it was referred by the Committee on Appropriations, with the understanding that it will report in one week, as was ordered by the Senate on June 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion is withdrawn.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. RISCH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill (S. 1790), as amended, is agreed to.

The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill, as amended, is passed.

The bill (S. 1790), as amended, was passed.

The bill, as modified, as amended, will be printed in a future edition of the Record.

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 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCConnell. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. REED. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Rounds).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Bennet), the Senator from New York (Mrs. Gillibrand), the Senator from California (Ms. Harris), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Sanders), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 8, as follows:

YEA—86


NAY—8

Boozman  Burr  Carper  Feinstein  Collins  Coons  Cornyn  Cotton  Manchin  Menendez

NOT VOTING—6

Bennet  Gillibrand  Grassley  Klobuchar  Harris  Rounds  Sanders  Warren

I urge all of my colleagues to join the chairman and me in supporting this excellent legislation.
Despite then-Candidate Trump’s campaign rhetoric, I and others hoped that he would heed the advice of the advisors with respect to the Iran nuclear agreement, also known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or the JCPOA.

For example, despite personal concerns about the JCPOA before it was signed, former Secretary of Defense Mattis told the Armed Services Committee at his confirmation hearing that when America gives her word, we have to live up to it and work with our allies.

In October 2017, Secretary Mattis told the Armed Services Committee that he believed it was in our national interest to remain in the JCPOA. General Dunford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, echoed these sentiments at the time and cautioned that, in his words, “the U.S. will incur damage vis-a-vis our allies if we unilaterally withdraw from the JCPOA. Our allies are less likely to cooperate with us on future military action to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon and less likely to cooperate with us on countering other destabilizing aspects of Iranian behavior that collectively impact us.”

The administration should have sought to work with the international community to address the challenges posed by Iran by building upon the foundation of the JCPOA rather than squandering the benefits in favor of “putting Iran on notice” and other inflammatory rhetoric.

Just over a year ago, President Trump made the disastrous decision to unilaterally withdraw the United States from the JCPOA and reimpose nuclear-related sanctions, in violation of previous U.S. commitments under the deal. Since withdrawing from the deal, the Trump administration has taken a series of additional escalatory actions, including the imposition of new sanctions on various aspects of the Iranian economy; cancellation of waivers that previously allowed importation of Iranian oil by China, India, Japan, South Korea, and Turkey; and the designation of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps—often referred to as the IRGC—as a foreign terrorist organization.

The designation of a foreign government entity as a foreign terrorist organization is unprecedented, and it is not clear what purpose it served other than to unnecessarily raise tensions with Iran. As I learned during a recent visit to Iraq and Afghanistan, the IRGC designation has significantly complicated our relationships with foreign partners who described the action as provocative and destabilizing.

While the JCPOA was not a perfect deal, it was a necessary deal. It is important to remember that when the JCPOA was signed, Iran’s “breakout” timeline—the amount of time Iran would need to produce enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon—was only 2 to 3 months. Even by the most conservative estimates, the JCPOA stretched that timeline to more than a year.

By all accounts, the JCPOA has worked as intended. The JCPOA commits Iran to never seeking to develop nuclear weapons and effectively cuts off all pathways for Iran to achieve a nuclear weapon until at least 2030. The agreement dramatically reduced Iran’s stockpile of enriched uranium and the number of installed centrifuges. It also prevented Iran from producing plutonium and has subjected Iran to the most intrusive monitoring regime in the world to ensure it is living up to its commitments.

The JCPOA was appropriately built upon the concept of “distrust and verify,” and I support efforts by our European partners, as well as Russia and China, to preserve the JCPOA despite challenges the Trump administration has put in their way.

General Dunford, in the absence of the JCPOA, Iran would likely resume its nuclear weapons program, and, in his words, “a nuclear-armed Iran would likely be more aggressive in its actions and more dangerous in its consequences.”

Unfortunately, the administration’s withdrawal from the agreement and reimposition of sanctions has left us isolated from our allies and partners while emboldening the hardliners in Iran.

In May of last year, subsequent to the decision to withdraw from the JCPOA, Secretary of State Pompeo articulated a set of 12 “demands” and indicated that “major changes” would need to be made by Iran before sanctions relief would be provided. The administration has sent mixed messages on whether its demands should be viewed as a set of preconditions for discussions on sanctions relief. The demands outlined by Secretary Pompeo are widely viewed as maximalist and leave little room for negotiation, especially given that the administration has already reneged on previous diplomatic commitments related to Iran’s nuclear program.

Without greater certainty by the administration on what specific actions would need to be taken by Iran to relieve U.S. economic pressure, I fear that Iran has little incentive to engage in negotiations.

Indeed, the administration has followed that initial set of 12 demands with a succession of orchestrated steps to force Iran into an ever-smaller corner that only serves to increase the odds of miscalculation and reduce diplomatic opportunities. The economic sanctions by the United States have left the Iranian economy reeling, with its gross domestic product shrinking by 5 percent and the inflation rate rising by 50 percent.

As part of this so-called “Maximum Pressure” campaign, the administration has just announced personal sanctions against Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei and other Iranian leadership. The Iranians have responded by indicating that these sanctions mean “the permanent closure of the doors of diplomacy.”

Rather than modifying its behavior, Iran has stepped up its aggression and subsequent escalatory actions by increasing its malign activities in the region, including in Yemen and Syria, and announcing that it would stop complying with certain aspects of the JCPOA. If Iran follows through on these threats, the departures from the JCPOA and resume nuclear weapons development activities, the United States and the international community will be in a much less unified and therefore weaker negotiating position than we had leading up to the JCPOA.

As I assess the current state of affairs, I see four potential outcomes of the current approach being pursued by the administration.

First, Iran could bend to the will of the administration and announce its compliance with the so-called 12 demands laid out by Secretary Pompeo. However, Iran has a long history of struggle against outside forces. A notable example is the Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s, which illustrates that Iranian capitulation would likely threaten its top priority of regime survival, so clearly this is an unrealistic outcome.

Second, Iran could remain in the JCPOA despite seeing little of the economic benefits promised by the deal and hope that a future U.S. administration would return to the agreement. Iran’s recent announcement that it would stop complying with aspects of the JCPOA is a signal that it views the current arrangement as unsustainable and is willing to abandon the JCPOA completely if its economic situation does not improve in the near term.

Third, Iran could agree to return to the negotiating table, seeking a reduction of economic sanctions and easing of sanctions. However, both the administration and Iranian leaders have made clear that they are not interested in such an approach.

In announcing the administration’s strategy for Iran last May, Secretary Pompeo stated that President Trump is “ready, willing, and able to negotiate a new deal” but also made clear that “we will not renegotiate the JCPOA itself.”

On May 8, Iranian President Rouhani stated: “We are ready to negotiate, within the boundaries of JCPOA. . . . It is not us who left the negotiation table. We do not believe that we should negotiate with Iran. We need to be clear, as we have always been, that we cannot negotiate about things that are not important to us.”

These seem to be irreconcilable positions, especially after the latest round of sanctions directed at the Iranian leadership.

Lastly and most significant, I believe, the current approach could result in a military conflict between the United States and Iran. The destruction of an American unmanned drone flying in international airspace by a missile fired from Iran is an example of the potential for widespread conflict. Only at the last minute did President
Trump call off a strike against the Iranian missile sites in retaliation. He concluded correctly that such a strike would be disproportionate. But the incident underscores the precarious position we are in after months of the misguidance of the Trump Administration.

Iranian action, either directed by national leadership or mistakenly taken by zealous supporters, could put us on an escalatory ladder of strike and counterstrike that would involve the entire region from Afghanistan to the Levant.

In addition and equally troubling is that an unarticulated goal of this so-called “Maximum Pressure” campaign is to prompt Iran to leave the JCPOA either officially or by gradually increasing its stock of highly enriched uranium or other aspects of its nuclear program. This could give advocates for a military strike on Iran increased leverage in promoting both a domestic and an international constituency to support its proxy Hezbollah. Iran has gained influence with Iraq’s armed forces through communication through Iraq and Syria into Lebanon, Iraq, and Yemen. Iran also exerts influence in Yemen, often through proxies and surrogates. Iran, through itsfingerprints (the Iran Threat Network), has provided Iran with its most advanced ground operations, a more limited conflict would be very difficult to manage or to bring to a conclusion.

The President and others in the administration have consistently downplayed the potential costs of conflict with Iran. In fact, just yesterday, the President said that “if something should happen [with Iran], we’re in a very strong position. It wouldn’t last very long.” The President’s assessment is undercut by his own Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, who told Congress earlier this year:

Iran continues to develop and approve a range of new military capabilities to target U.S. and allied military assets in the region, including long-range missiles, advanced naval mines, unmanned explosive boats, submarines and advanced torpedoes, and antiship and land-attack cruise missiles. Iran has the largest ballistic missile force in the Middle East and can strike targets up to 2,000 kilometers from Iran’s borders. Russia’s delivery of the SA-20C SAM system in 2016 has provided Iran with its most advanced long-range air defense system.

In addition to the conventional military capabilities laid out by Director Coats, Iran maintains a network of proxy forces in the region, many of whom operate in close proximity to U.S. and allied interests in Iraq and Syria. They maintain the capability to conduct lethal action against our forces and facilities without notice.

Recently retired commander of the U.S. Central Command, General Votel, told the Armed Services Committee in February:

The Iranian regime has taken steps to increase its capabilities to conduct military action against the United States and our friends in the region. Iran has made clear its interest in obtaining the capability to strike U.S. targets in the Persian Gulf.

I urge the President and those in the administration to take this moment of high tension to engage with our allies and partners with the goal of seeking a diplomatic solution to the current situation. In that context and in that spirit, I will support the Udall amendment tomorrow.
BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the 116th Congress, so far, has just talked about the humanitarian crisis at the border. Most of our Democratic colleagues have claimed up to this point that there is no crisis or emergency at the border.

We will recall that we started out the year with a government shutdown because of the battle over border security, and our Democratic friends made one thing perfectly clear: They would oppose any effort to fund our security mission at the border. That resulted in the 35-day shutdown.

The Speaker of the House at the time called the situation “a fake crisis at the border,” and the minority leader here in the Senate referred to it as “a crisis that does not exist.” Well, they weren’t the only ones. Throughout the Halls of the Capitol, Democrats in Congress used terms like “phony,” “imaginary,” and “make-believe” to describe the challenges our frontline officers and agents were facing every day.

While our Democratic colleagues have reflexively denied the existence of a crisis at the border, the problems have grown only bigger each day. Of course, it was 2014, I will remind my friends across the aisle, when Barack Obama, then President of the United States, declared a humanitarian and security crisis at the border. So it seemed very odd to me that, in 2019, they decided—when the numbers kept getting bigger and conditions got worse—of a sudden that the humanitarian and security crisis had gone away.

The fact is, over the last 3 months, the number of illegal crossings across the southwestern border have hit six figures, something we haven’t seen since 2006. We surpassed the number of unaccompanied children apprehended at the height of the 2014 crisis that President Obama was speaking about.

This inaction has nearly depleted our Federal resources, causing the President to request $4.6 billion for humanitarian assistance and border operations. That request came almost 2 months ago—almost 2 months ago, and Congress has not acted.

Now, it seems, our Democratic colleagues have finally accepted the facts. There is a very real and very urgent humanitarian crisis on our southern border. That inaction has nearly depleted our Federal resources, causing the President to request $4.6 billion for humanitarian assistance and border operations. That request came almost 2 months ago—almost 2 months ago, and Congress has not acted.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on another note, I listened with great interest as the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Rhode Island, spoke about Iran and the challenges we face there. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island, maybe even most of what he had to say.

The American people were appalled when, last week, Iran took down an unmanned American aircraft over international waters. As the Senator said, ordinarily, Iran operates by proxies or by third parties, whether it is the Shia militia in Iraq or Hezbollah or one of their other terrorist proxies like those operating in Yemen, the Houthis. But Iran escalated its attack against the United States, declared a humanitarian and security crisis at the border. So it seemed very odd to me that, in 2019, they decided—when the numbers kept getting bigger and conditions got worse—of a sudden that the humanitarian and security crisis had gone away.

The fact is, over the last 3 months, the number of illegal crossings across the southwestern border have hit six figures, something we haven’t seen since 2006. We surpassed the number of unaccompanied children apprehended at the height of the 2014 crisis that President Obama was speaking about.
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The American people were appalled when, last week, Iran took down an unmanned American aircraft over international waters. As the Senator said, ordinarily, Iran operates by proxies or by third parties, whether it is the Shia militia in Iraq or Hezbollah or one of their other terrorist proxies like those operating in Yemen, the Houthis. But Iran escalated its attack against the United States, declared a humanitarian and security crisis at the border. So it seemed very odd to me that, in 2019, they decided—when the numbers kept getting bigger and conditions got worse—of a sudden that the humanitarian and security crisis had gone away.

The fact is, over the last 3 months, the number of illegal crossings across the southwestern border have hit six figures, something we haven’t seen since 2006. We surpassed the number of unaccompanied children apprehended at the height of the 2014 crisis that President Obama was speaking about.

This inaction has nearly depleted our Federal resources, causing the President to request $4.6 billion for humanitarian assistance and border operations. That request came almost 2 months ago—almost 2 months ago, and Congress has not acted.
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we saw the details of that deal in 2015, it quickly became clear that it was not much of a deal at all. If the goal is to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon—well, it obviously failed in that goal.

As the majority leader said at the time, it “appears to fall well short of the goal we all thought was trying to be achieved, which was that Iran would not be a nuclear state.”

Despite the restrictions it would impose, the deal would leave Iran with a vast nuclear program and allow it to continue to conduct research and development on advanced centrifuges and building intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Perhaps worse, the nuclear deal would lift those restrictions in a decade. In other words, it was 2015 when the JCPOA was signed by the relevant parties. So by postponing Iran’s ability to develop a nuclear weapon, we are already 10 years late to the party. So it is no wonder that then-Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu delivered an address to Congress in March of 2015 and said the JCPOA “doesn’t block Iran’s path to the bomb; it paves Iran’s path to the bomb.” That certainly seemed like a warning.

We have seen reports that the economic sanctions waived as part of the deal have allowed Iran to maintain its nuclear capabilities. In 2015, Iran continued to ramp up its uranium enrichment to 3.67 percent. In 2016, Iran began to exceed the limits on its nuclear material.

The current tensions with Iran today illustrate a broader point that the deal is not working as intended to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. We have seen reports that the economic sanctions waived as part of the deal have allowed Iran to maintain its nuclear capabilities.

The actions taken by Iran show that they are no longer bound by the restrictions of the JCPOA. They have continued to develop nuclear technology and have threatened to abandon the deal if the United States does not lift the sanctions. Their actions demonstrate that the deal is not working as intended to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

As the majority leader said at the time, the JCPOA “appears to fall well short of the goal we all thought was trying to be achieved, which was that Iran would not be a nuclear state.”

We have seen reports that the economic sanctions waived as part of the deal have allowed Iran to maintain its nuclear capabilities. In 2015, Iran continued to ramp up its uranium enrichment to 3.67 percent. In 2016, Iran began to exceed the limits on its nuclear material.

The current tensions with Iran today illustrate a broader point that the deal is not working as intended to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. We have seen reports that the economic sanctions waived as part of the deal have allowed Iran to maintain its nuclear capabilities.

The actions taken by Iran show that they are no longer bound by the restrictions of the JCPOA. They have continued to develop nuclear technology and have threatened to abandon the deal if the United States does not lift the sanctions. Their actions demonstrate that the deal is not working as intended to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

As the majority leader said at the time, the JCPOA “appears to fall well short of the goal we all thought was trying to be achieved, which was that Iran would not be a nuclear state.”

We have seen reports that the economic sanctions waived as part of the deal have allowed Iran to maintain its nuclear capabilities. In 2015, Iran continued to ramp up its uranium enrichment to 3.67 percent. In 2016, Iran began to exceed the limits on its nuclear material.

The current tensions with Iran today illustrate a broader point that the deal is not working as intended to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. We have seen reports that the economic sanctions waived as part of the deal have allowed Iran to maintain its nuclear capabilities.

The actions taken by Iran show that they are no longer bound by the restrictions of the JCPOA. They have continued to develop nuclear technology and have threatened to abandon the deal if the United States does not lift the sanctions. Their actions demonstrate that the deal is not working as intended to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

As the majority leader said at the time, the JCPOA “appears to fall well short of the goal we all thought was trying to be achieved, which was that Iran would not be a nuclear state.”

We have seen reports that the economic sanctions waived as part of the deal have allowed Iran to maintain its nuclear capabilities. In 2015, Iran continued to ramp up its uranium enrichment to 3.67 percent. In 2016, Iran began to exceed the limits on its nuclear material.

The current tensions with Iran today illustrate a broader point that the deal is not working as intended to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. We have seen reports that the economic sanctions waived as part of the deal have allowed Iran to maintain its nuclear capabilities.

The actions taken by Iran show that they are no longer bound by the restrictions of the JCPOA. They have continued to develop nuclear technology and have threatened to abandon the deal if the United States does not lift the sanctions. Their actions demonstrate that the deal is not working as intended to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.
Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Let me begin by thanking Ranking Member Jack REED of Rhode Island and Chairman INHOFE of Oklahoma, as well as my other colleagues on the committee and my staff, who have worked tirelessly on this to include key elements of my proposal that are important to our military, as well as to our Nation.

This NDAA includes comprehensive reforms to the Military Housing Privatization Initiative. It changes military housing policies that are long overdue and will prioritize families, ensure long-term quality assurance, and enhance accountability.

In the hearings held by the Armed Services Committee with military families who have experienced adverse health effects and financial burden from residing in hazardous housing, one point was absolutely clear: Our Nation is failing military families who are living in poor housing.

The conditions, widespread and prevalent, are entirely unacceptable. I was heartbroken to hear much of this testimony from military families who already sacrifice so much and who have struggled to secure safe and livable conditions.

I visited some of the homes at the New London base, and I was struck by the mold, the repairs that were needed, the defects in appliances, and the complaints about lack of proper air-conditioning and heating. We owe our military families much better, and we owe law enforcement the support they need to crack down on fraudulent private contractors.

I am proud that the NDAA includes my provision to prohibit the Trump administration from modifying military installations to detain migrant children who have been forcibly separated from their parents. The separation policies have been absolutely abhorrent and antithetical to our values and ideals. They have been shameful and disgraceful.

We have seen the photos, and those pictures are worth a thousand of my words today, but the misuse of military resources, as I have repeatedly emphasized, to implement this administration’s radical immigration enforcement agenda—this provision is a small but necessary step toward protecting migrant families from the cruelties of this family separation policy. It is only the beginning. We need to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security reimburses the Defense Department when military resources are used for support at the border. This kind of measure will hopefully prevent DHS from using the Pentagon as a piggy bank—a financial resource for cruel and inhumane policies.

We need to ensure that the President is stopped from abusing his Executive authority by deploying troops to assist in deportation.

We also considered floor amendments to the NDAA. I want to highlight an amendment that I offered to improve equity in the post-9/11 GI bill benefit. Last July, the Pentagon issued a new policy on servicemembers’ ability to transfer unused education benefits to their family members. These new policies prevent servicemembers with more than 16 years of military service from transferring education benefits at the time that military servicemembers opt to transfer rather than when they become eligible. The Pentagon argues that these changes were made to ensure that servicemembers have the key retention tool—all while breaking our promise to military families by moving the goalpost of transfer eligibility and exacerbating inequities in transferring educational benefits. Most notably, disqualifying servicemembers with more than 16 years of military services counterintuitively penalizes the men and women who have served this country in uniform.

My amendment would make the post-9/11 GI bill an earned benefit rather than a retention tool and ensure that all servicemembers who have completed 10 years of service in the armed services and Armed Forces are eligible to transfer their benefits to dependents at any time, both while serving on Active Duty and as a veteran.

Despite the passage of the NDAA and the need for this amendment continuing, I will continue to champion equitable education benefits for our military families.

This year’s NDAA makes important, unprecedented investments in the submarines, helicopters, and aircraft built in Connecticut. They are not only manufactured in my State—employing thousands of skilled workers vital to our defense industrial base—but they are also critical to our national security. They keep our country safe, and they make sure our Nation and our military are ready to fight. They play a vital role in our defense industry thanks to the unparalleled skills and unstinting dedication of our manufacturing workforce. Because of that workforce, we are able to build the best submarines and the best F-35s, engine and other aircraft engines and helicopters in the world—not only through that skilled workforce and those major contractors but the workers at suppliers and contractors, who are equally vital.

Last year, we built two submarines. This year, there will be two more, with procurement for another major part of a submarine. As we begin accelerating production of those Virginia-class submarines, we need to ensure we have the capacity to support increased submarine output. That is why I fought for $72.3 million to replace Pier 32 at Sub Base New London, ensuring a modern landing to accommodate multiple Virginia-class submarines.

I was proud to lead the fight for increased investment in those Virginia-class submarines. That included $4.7 billion for those two submarines and nearly $4.3 billion in that advance procurement for a third Virginia-class submarine.

The NDAA also includes $2.3 billion—which is $140 million above the President’s request—for the Columbia-class submarine. The NDAA also includes $2.3 billion—which is $140 million above the President’s request—for the Columbia-class submarine.

I was proud, as well, to champion over $10 billion for 94 F-35s, which are important to all of our military services. That is an additional 16 above the President’s request.

In helicopter production, we will keep faith with the wartifghters and with our defense industrial base at Sikorsky.

Today’s effort is a tribute to the leadership and the bipartisan efforts in
this Congress. I thank and applaud my colleagues for coming together on behalf of our Nation’s defense, which is especially important in a time of disillusionment and seeming dysfunction for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

REMEMBERING WILLIAM MODEN

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor an officer of the Colorado State Patrol whose watch tragically came to an end earlier this month when he was killed in the line of duty.

On June 14, 2019, Trooper William Moden was responding to an accident that occurred on I-70 in Deer Trail, CO. He was doing what he did every day—responding to an incident and giving a helping hand to Coloradans in need. He was assisting the passengers of a vehicle who were involved in a crash—one of whom was an 18-month-old child—when he was struck by a passing vehicle.

Like too many of our Nation’s law enforcement officers, Trooper Moden gave his life while protecting and serving others.

William Moden was 37 years old and had served in the Colorado State Patrol for 12 years. His fellow troopers remember him as someone whose uniform was always perfect and whose boots were always polished. There is no doubt for any of them that he was meant to serve and that he did so with the utmost honor and dignity.

While Trooper Moden carried out his duties with seriousness, his friends and loved ones remember him as someone with a tremendous sense of humor. At a memorial service held last week, he was described as having an infectious laugh—a laugh that was usually the loudest of all. Many at the service remembered the time he put on a dog’s shock collar just to see how it felt and to make others laugh. These are the kinds of memories his loved ones will remember forever.

Just as he answered when his Coloradans called, his friends and family say he was someone who could always be counted on. He was reliable, dependable, and they often described him as someone who could always be counted on. He was reliable, dependable, and they often described him as someone who could always be counted on.

On June 14, 2019, Trooper William Moden was responding to an accident that occurred on I-70 in Deer Trail, CO. He was doing what he did every day—responding to an incident and giving a helping hand to Coloradans in need. He was assisting the passengers of a vehicle who were involved in a crash—one of whom was an 18-month-old child—when he was struck by a passing vehicle.

Like too many of our Nation’s law enforcement officers, Trooper Moden gave his life while protecting and serving others.

William Moden was 37 years old and had served in the Colorado State Patrol for 12 years. His fellow troopers remember him as someone whose uniform was always perfect and whose boots were always polished. There is no doubt for any of them that he was meant to serve and that he did so with the utmost honor and dignity.

While Trooper Moden carried out his duties with seriousness, his friends and loved ones remember him as someone with a tremendous sense of humor. At a memorial service held last week, he was described as having an infectious laugh—a laugh that was usually the loudest of all. Many at the service remembered the time he put on a dog’s shock collar just to see how it felt and to make others laugh. These are the kinds of memories his loved ones will remember forever.

Just as he answered when his Coloradans called, his friends and family say he was someone who could always be counted on. He was reliable, dependable, and they often described him as someone who could always be counted on.

We will never forget this heartfelt photo. More importantly, we will not forget the names of Oscar Alberto Martinez and his 23-month-old daughter, Valeria. They drowned in a desperate attempt to claim asylum in the United States.

Oscar, Valeria, and Tania, her mother, fled El Salvador in the hopes of seeking asylum in the United States. The Washington Post reported they traveled more than 1,000 miles seeking it. . . . But the farthest the family got was an international bridge in Matamoros, Mexico. On Sunday, they were told the bridge was closed and that they should return Monday. Aid workers told The Post the line to get across the bridge was hundreds long.

The young family was desperate. Standing on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande, America looked within reach. Martinez and Valeria waded in. But before they all made it to the other side, the river waters pulled the 25-year-old and his daughter under and swept them away.

Later, when Mexican authorities recovered their bodies, Oscar and Valeria were still clinging to each other.

Here in the United States, it is hard to imagine what kind of desperate conditions would propel you to flee your home and embark on a perilous journey in search of protection from a foreign nation.

Most of these families who arrive at our border come from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras—three countries that are collectively known as the Northern Triangle. It is a region that is plagued by transnational gang violence, weak institutions, and poverty.

Young boys are forced into servitude by gangs. Young girls are beaten and raped if they refuse to become their girlfriends. Parents who try to protect their children end up being killed. These countries are among the most dangerous in the world. In El Salvador, a woman is murdered every 19 hours, and in Honduras—the country with the highest homicide rate in the world for women—a woman is killed every 16 hours.

To be blunt, these families face an impossible choice. It is either stay and die or flee for a chance to live.

Well, if this horrific and tragic photograph does anything, I hope it dispels us of the ludicrous notion that you can deter desperate families from fleeing their homes in search of safety. That is how the Trump administration describes its cruel policies at the border—deterrence.

In the name of deterrence, it is tearing children and babies away from their mothers and fathers. In the name of deterrence, it is shutting down legal ports of entry and encouraging migrant families to seek more dangerous methods of getting into the United States, like crossing the Rio Grande. In the name of deterrence, children are being housed in unsanitary conditions, which leaves infants in dirty diapers and children without soap or toothpaste.

Let me share with our colleagues just a few of the statements that the children who have been kept in these abhorrent conditions made.

Said one 8-year-old boy:

They took us away from our grandmother, and now we are all alone. They have not
given us to our mother. We have been here for a long time. I have to take care of my little sister. She is very sad because she misses our mother and grandmother very much. . . . We sleep on the floor. There are two matts in the room, but the big kids sleep on the matts, so we have to sleep on the cement bench.

Consider the words of a 16-year-old girl:

We slept on matts on the floor, and they gave us aluminum blankets. They took our baby’s diapers, baby formula, and all of our belongings. Our clothes were still wet, and we were left there cold, so we got sick. . . . I have been in the U.S. for 6 days, and I have never been offered a shower or been able to brush my teeth. There is no soap, and our clothes are dirty. They have never been washed.

Finally, here are the words of a 17-year-old mother:

I was given a blanket and a mattress, but then, at 3 a.m., the guards took the blanket and mattress. My baby was left sleeping on the floor. In fact, almost every night, the guards wake us at 3 a.m. and take away our sleeping matts and blankets. . . . They leave babies, even little babies of 2 or 3 months, sleeping on the cold floor. For me, because I am so pregnant, sleeping on the floor is very painful for my back and hips. I think the guards act this way to punish us.

This is not the America I know. But this one does want us to forget who we are. This administration wants us to believe that if the Government of the United States is cruel enough, that if it denies those who seek asylum all semblances of humanity, that if we ignore basic standards of child welfare, and that if we abandon fundamental American values like respect for human rights, then desperate families who flee Central America will stop coming here.

It is not true. The entire doctrine of deterrence is grounded in hideous lies, beginning with the lie the President has fed the people from the moment he launched his campaign in 2015—the lie that immigrants are a threat to our security. President Trump has cast immigrants as criminals and rapists and drug dealers when the truth is that these migrants are the ones who are fleeing the criminals, the rapists, and the drug dealers.

I am sick and tired of these lies, like when the President repeatedly says he inherited the policy of family separation from the Obama administration. That is a lie. The Trump administration masterminded this despicable policy, pure and simple, and his policies are not working. They have done nothing to stem the tide of families who seek asylum in the United States. They have done nothing to stabilize Central America and to alleviate the conditions that force families to flee in the first place. It is time to turn the page. There are so many alternatives to detention that are available to the DHS that are far more humane and far less costly to the taxpayers.

Consider the Obama administration’s pilot program known as the family case management system. It established procedures to treat migrant families humanely as their cases moved forward. Pregnant women, nursing mothers, or mothers with young children were given caseworkers who helped to educate them on their rights and their responsibilities. They were connected to resources or to family in the country who could help them.

According to an inspector general’s report, the program was an enormous success: 99 percent of the time, families in the program showed up for their ICE check-ins and appointments. Likewise, they showed up 100 percent of the time for their immigration court hearings. Tell me—how many government programs work 100 percent of the time? It is very rare. This one did, but that didn’t stop President Trump from terminating it. Even though it had a 99-percent compliance rate and had 100 percent who showed up for their hearings, oh, no. Evidently, that was not good enough for the Trump administration, for it was far more humane and far less costly to the taxpayers.

Beyond every alternative to mass detention, we must ramp up humanitarian assistance at the border. That is why I voted yesterday for the House’s emergency supplemental bill, which would provide desperately needed support to on-the-ground organizations and would better ensure the humane treatment of children who are in CBP custody.

The House bill included strong guardrails to prevent this White House from using these funds to pursue its draconian detention practices and mass deportation agenda. While the Senate bill fell short in these areas, I hope the administration uses whatever money it receives or coerces from the children are properly cared for—in a way that respects basic human rights.

Solving this crisis will take more than humanitarian funding. If President Trump were serious about reducing migration, he could be working day and night to improve the conditions that are driving families to flee Central America in the first place. Instead, he has cut off aid to the Northern Triangle and has undermined critical U.S. efforts to work with Central American governments to crack down on gang violence, strengthen the rule of law, and alleviate poverty.

These programs were working, and the Trump administration knows it. Why do I say that? In recent years, Congress has not only increased funding for foreign assistance to Central America, but it has required these governments to meet clear benchmarks in order to demonstrate their progress in areas like combating drug trafficking and strengthening their legal systems. The Trump administration has acknowledged the effectiveness of these programs on several occasions. In fact, it has sent Congress not one, not two, but nine different reports that have certified these benchmarks have been met.

This one is dated August 11, 2018. There are nine certifications by the Secretary of State saying that the programs we had going on and working in Central America were, in fact, working.

But we all know this President has no respect for facts or evidence-based reality. His decision to punish Central American governments for the migration crisis by slashing aid is only making the crisis worse. It absolutely makes no sense.

If we want to reduce migration from Central America, we need a bold strategy to address the root causes driving families in fear from their home. That is why my colleagues and I have introduced the Central America Reform and Enforcement Act. Our bill would dramatically expand U.S. engagement in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala through proven programs that help strengthen the rule of law, combat violence, and build prosperity. Our bill would also minimize border crossings by expanding refugee processing centers in the region in an effort to reduce demand at the border, and, finally, it includes several measures to protect the welfare of children and ensure efficient, fair, and timely processing of asylum seekers.

Now, this administration may wish the Northern Triangle’s serious problems would just go away, but the longer we let these conditions fester, the greater this migration crisis will become.

There is a very real possibility that President Trump views a growing crisis at the border as an asset in his path to reelection in 2020. The President believes his best shot at winning elections is to stoke fear of migrant children who pose no threat but desperately need the safe embrace of Lady Liberty.

After all, President Trump cannot credibly say he is solving the student loan debt crisis or providing Americans with better, cheaper healthcare, or making sure that big corporations pay their fair share. He has failed on all these fronts and more. The only play left in the Trump playbook is to blame immigration and wrongful, not solving America’s problems.

That is what I call the politics of hate. The politics of hate is what led
President Trump to attempt to ban Muslims from traveling to the United States. The politics of hate is what led President Trump to end DACA and threaten 800,000 Dreamers with deportation to countries they have never called home. These children, through no choice of their own were brought to the United States, the only country they have ever pledged allegiance to is the United States and to the flag of the United States. The only nation in which they know is the Star Spangled Banner. The only place they have ever called home is America.

The politics of hate is what led President Trump to attack TPS holders and jeopardize thousands of parents to American-born children. The politics of hate is what led the administration to forcibly separate nearly 2,800 children from their parents—and maybe thousands more, because they don’t even have a recordkeeping system of where all of these children are. That is a policy that will forever be a stain on our history.

The politics of hate is what led President Trump to tweet out his plan to send ICE agents into our communities to terrorize our towns and cities with mass arrests and mass deportations. It is a plan that would leave millions of U.S.-born American citizen children wondering if they would ever come to pick me up at school or why dad never made it home for dinner. It is a plan that would inflict traumatic and irrepairable harm on American children who would not only have to reckon with the loss of their parents but the loss of the income provided by that parent. The politics of hate led to the remain-in-Mexico policy, which forces asylum seekers to remain in Mexico amid dangerous conditions.

Indeed, just yesterday, U.S. asylum officers requested that the courts block the Trump administration from requiring migrants to stay in Mexico, stating it is “fundamentally contrary to the moral fabric of our Nation and our international domestic legal obligations.”

Now, in the latest action, I fear it is the politics of hate that explain the awful press reports we heard today suggesting that President Trump plans to end a program that protects undocumented members of U.S. military families from deportation. Imagine—someone who wears the uniform of the United States, who may serve halfway around the world in service to the Nation, who risks their lives, and now you are going to take the one program that put their mind at ease—that their spouse or child, who may be undocum- ented in the country and had the ability so of that, member’s service, and now you are going to say you are going to deport their children, their spouse.

Well, if someone is willing to wear the uniform of the United States, pledge allegiance to our flag, and risk their life to defend this Nation in battle, the last thing we ought to do is to deport their loved ones.

The Trump administration’s policies at our border have brought us nothing but chaos, despair, and shame. We cannot let the politics of fear and hate degrade the values that make America great.

We cannot walk off our country from the strife gripping Central America. We cannot tweet our way out of this problem. We must lead our way out of this problem with real solutions and strategies that bring sanity, dignity, and order back to our border and prevent the horrific human tragedy we saw earlier this week on the banks of the Rio Grande. We are just better than this. We are just better than this.

If my colleagues do not raise their voices, then, they are complicit to this. History will judge us poorly.

I hope we will have bipartisan voices who say: This is not who we are; this is not what we stand for. And we can work toward making sure this tragic photograph never happens again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I was coming to floor today to talk about legislation we just got passed in the last week in the Homeland Security Appropriations Committee that I can convince some of my colleagues to join us in this effort, and I will talk about that bill in a moment. But first let me, if I could, address the photograph and the comments from my colleague from New Jersey.

He showed a tragic photograph that so many of my constituents and all Americans have seen—Oscar Alberto Martinez Ramirez and his daughter Valeria, facedown in the Rio Grande.

This man came from El Salvador. We don’t know all the details yet, but clearly he was interested in coming to the United States and applying for asylum, as so many others have come—hundreds a day, thousands a week, hundreds of thousands a month now, overwhelming the infrastructure at the border, pulling 40 to 60 percent of our Border Patrol off the border to deal with the humanitarian crisis that has occurred.

That tragic photograph—and it is a horrific photo of a daughter clinging to her father’s neck, having drowned in the Rio Grande coming over from Mexico—should be a wake-up call. I agree with that, but it should not be a wake-up call to have us continue to point fingers around the at the other side and blame someone else for the problem. It should instead be a wake-up call for solutions—for bipartisan solutions—because that is all that works to be able to resolve these issues.

I hope that first step will be taken today, because I just learned, as I came to the floor, that the House of Rep- resentatives is now considering taking up the legislation we passed here in the Senate just yesterday. It provides immediate emergency funds for humanitarian assistance at the border that is needed right now. We passed it with over 80 votes here in the Senate—82 votes, with 9 of our Members absent, I believe. Over 82 votes is very unusual for anything to happen in this particular something so substantial.

It is bipartisan. It came out of the Appropriations Committee with a 30-to-1 vote to get these funds and these resources down to the border now to help with this true humanitarian crisis that we are facing. Everyone must acknowledge that.

The House was balking at that. They were sending us another bill that had some partisan elements to it that no Republican could support in the House—not a single one.

Finally, I think they have decided to pick up our bipartisan bill and pass it, and thank God, because now the President can sign it and that aid can go down to our border immediately where it is needed.

But I have to be frank with you. That humanitarian aid going down to the border is not enough because I don’t think it would have had an impact on the tragic photograph that was talked about on the floor earlier.

That incident did not occur because of the lack of humanitarian aid that is badly needed. That incident occurred because there is this pull factor to come to our country, particularly from these Northern Triangle countries—Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador. This particular gentleman, Oscar Alberto Martinez Ramirez, came from El Salvador.

There is push factors from those countries. And, again, this is causing so many families to come here, so many unaccompanied children to come here from these three countries in Central America.

There is the traffickers are telling them: If you come to America and you ask for asylum, you will be let in.

Let’s be frank. These countries are countries that have real challenges and real problems.

My colleague from New Jersey is right. We have sent a lot of American taxpayer dollars down to those countries, and he noted that the reports back from the administration and others are positive, saying it is beginning to make a difference, particularly noted that that funding is now being reduced or even eliminated in some cases, but it was during the time when that funding was there that the people started coming.

So, yes, we should have more funding that is effective for those countries. I agree with that. The Millennium Challenge Corporation funding is the new way we send that funding. It is more effective because it says: What are you doing in Central America to improve your infrastructure, your education, your judicial system, your rule of law, and to fight corruption? We need to do all those things.
But let’s be frank. Let’s be honest. We have been doing that, and yet the push factor is still there. So I believe it is part of the answer, but I don’t think logic applied to this situation means that you could say that it is all of the answer because we have been doing it for years.

My taxpayers and other taxpayers, I think, around this country are willing to do more, but they also want to deal with the pull factor, and the pull factor is very simple. If you come to America and you apply for asylum right now, with the system being overwhelmed and with certain laws in place, including a court decision, you are released into the community, meaning you come into America. Most of the court cases that deal with whether you are successful or not in your asylum claim take over 2 years now. It takes over 2 years until you are before a judge for a hearing.

When those court cases occur, we are told by the Homeland Security Committee, that about 15 percent of those individuals are granted asylum—15 percent.

Now, in America, our wages are 10 to 20 times higher than they are in these Northern Triangle countries—El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras. Is it any wonder that they come here seeking a better way of life? No, you would too. But we have to have a system of laws here in this country where, yes, we accept people who have claims of asylum that are granted, but we don’t have open borders.

We have a system here, a system of laws, and it has clearly broken down now. Again, thousands come in every week, hundreds of thousands every month—mostly families, mostly children because of the way our laws work. I don’t think we should be separating families, by the way. So, if you have a child with you or you are a child, then you have to be addressed. But if we just play politics with this on the basis, deal not just with the pull factors but also the pull factors and deal with them realistically.

Unaccompanied kids coming from Guatemala were told: You can get in. It is good. We will take care of you. In this case, the traffickers took mortgages on the parents’ homes. They brought these kids to the United States, to the Department of Health and Human Services, detention facility. They were then sent out to sponsor families, which is what they do. They take these minor children, underaged, and send them to sponsor families. Sometimes they can find families; sometimes they can’t. Sometimes the government will send these kids back to the traffickers because the traffickers applied for the very kids they had brought up from Guatemala.

Despite claims and promises to their parents that they would get a good education with a family taking care of these kids, do you know what they did with these kids? They put them on an egg farm in Ohio—underage kids—and exploited them. They took away their pay, had them live in conditions none of us would find acceptable for any family of our family. They had them living in trailers, some of them under trailers, on mattresses without sheets, working 12 hours a day. Some of these kids were working 6 days a week, some 7 days a week. This is not America. Yet this was happening. Again, our system is broken. These traffickers were exploiting children.

Finally, in this case, law enforcement, immigration agency, have been able to indict and convict the traffickers. Thank goodness. But this is not a situation that can or should continue.

In the tragic photo of the story I just told, the answer is not politically pointing fingers. Blaming Donald Trump isn’t going to solve this problem. We need as a body to change the laws. We need as a body to provide more effective aid to those countries. That is true. The push factors and the pull factors need to be addressed. But if we just play politics with this on both sides, we will have more unnecessary deaths. We will have more tragic situations.

Again, I had planned to come and talk about something else, and I will, briefly. But I must say, with regard to this immigration challenge we face as a country, I hope the tragedy we have now seen online and on TV serves as a wake-up call to get to bipartisan solutions that actually help solve this problem. And stop the pull factors and the push factors that will continue to bring hundreds of thousands of people from these three countries to our border, which has overwhelmed us.

Today there is a start. Today there is a start with the humanitarian aid package. Thank goodness.

Tomorrow we need to get to work to talk about these bigger problems. I will say, I have worked on this with some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I heard the words today from my colleague from New Jersey about refugee processing centers. I think that is part of the answer. In the Obama administration, you could apply for refugee status from your country—El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras—and not come to the border. The refugee criteria is almost identical to the criteria for asylum. The United Nations does this all over the world. I agree, that is a better way of life.

Let’s have these processing centers in the Northern Triangle countries. Let’s have one in Mexico, maybe one in Mexico at the southern border with Guatemala, maybe one at the northern border of the United States, to deal with this processing problem. Let’s determine who is qualified, who has a legitimate fear of persecution. Again, 15 percent of them are now being granted. The other 85 percent are not. For the others, we have to say: You can apply to come to the United States as everybody else does, from Mexico, from the Philippines, from India, from countries in Africa, and we need to continue to be a generous country with regard to immigration. We have a system of laws, and we have to stop these tragedies where people are being told by traffickers: You can make this journey to the north. It will be fine.

It is not fine. It is arduous, it is dangerous, and you see the results.

The trafficking that is going on of girls and women is all part of this too. It is not going to stop unless we as a group here in Congress, on a bipartisan basis, deal not just with the push factors but also the pull factors and deal with them realistically.

NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, the legislation I came to the floor to talk about today passed in the Homeland Security Committee last week to help make our synagogues, our churches, our mosques, and other nonprofit institutions safer.

Sadly, we have seen a troubling pattern in recent years. Hate-fueled attacks at houses of worship and religious institutions, not just in our country but around the world, are becoming more and more common. A couple of months ago, a shooting at a synagogue outside San Diego took the life of Lori Gilbert Kaye, who heroically sacrificed herself to save her rabbi. Exactly 6 months to the day prior to that, the shooting at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, PA, claimed 11 lives, the worst act of anti-Semitic violence in U.S. history.

Sometimes this hate is manifested in other ways: bomb threats at the Jewish Community Center in Columbus, OH, and anti-Semitic graffiti sprayed on the Hebrew Union College walls in my hometown of Cincinnati, OH.

Right after the attacks on the synagogue in Pittsburgh last year, I went to the Jewish Community Center in Youngstown, OH, only 60 miles away from Pittsburgh. I met with Jewish community leaders. An attack on one is an attack on all. We must all stand up.
In Youngstown that somber day, we talked about where we go from here to stop anti-Semitism and hatred. I asked them for input about what the Federal Government can do to help keep the Jewish community safe. Part of the input I got was that we need more help on security and more resources to protect our community centers, our schools, our churches, our synagogues, our mosques.

The resurgence of this anti-Semitism must be confronted and defeated with all the tools we can bring to bear. But sadly, it is not just related to the Jewish community, which has known it for over the centuries. Hate seldom stops at one religion or one country.

Hundreds of Christians in Sri Lanka were massacred in churches and hotels on Easter Sunday. In New Zealand, the shooting at the mosques in Christchurch killed at least 49 people. We will never forget the 2015 tragic killings of African-American parishioners at Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, SC, where I have visited and prayed, or the 2017 attacks on the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, TX.

While I have highlighted unconscionable murders, there are so many other examples of vandalism and harassment. We saw this in my home State of Ohio this February, where a man holding a gun smashed the windows of a mosque in Dayton while worshippers prayed inside. We saw it in Louisiana this April when three historically Black churches were deliberately burned down within the same parish. This violence is senseless and contrary to our values as Americans.

Our first obligation as Americans and certainly as public officials is to stand up and say this must stop. Stop the hate—not just partisan finger-pointing but a single, unified message. Targeted communities cannot stop it on their own. We must remind all of our fellow citizens that we are all made in the image of God, and the anti-Semitism, the hatred, and the violence are not acceptable in this country.

Sadly, if these trends are any indication, we also have to recognize these attacks are likely to continue, and I think Congress can and should do more to provide synagogues, mosques, churches, and other faith-based organizations with best practices and more resources to secure their facilities and to train personnel.

Based in part on the input I received in Youngstown that sad day, I have been the leading supporter of the Nonprofit Security Grant Program. This grant program allows nonprofits, including synagogues and other faith-based organizations, to apply for funds they can use to access best practices to secure their facilities and to train personnel.

Some good news came out recently. Under the new Department of Homeland Security rules, nonprofits are now permitted to hire armed security personnel with these funds. That is something I had promoted. I think it is a good idea because it is needed. Last year, I led a bipartisan letter with Senator CASEY to push for a total of $60 million for the program nationwide. I am happy to say that funding level was incorporated in the final Homeland Security appropriations bill.

This year, I am working with my colleagues to actually authorize this program to be sure it will be there in the future and to increase the amount of funding in the program to $75 million so that nonprofits outside of the largest urban areas—which are currently being served through the initial program—also have access to this funding.

Unfortunately, in a lot of instances I talked about earlier, it was not in major urban centers. So it is being spread well beyond our big cities.

To support that effort, my colleague Senator GARY PETERS and I have introduced bipartisan legislation called the Preventing and Protecting Organizations from Terrorism Act to provide best practices and more funding for hardening vulnerable nonprofits and faith-based institutions and for training resources for those congregations.

The bill authorizes $75 million annually for the next 5 years, $50 million to be used by nonprofits located within high-risk, large urban areas, and the rest will be available for nonprofits in other areas.

I am pleased to report that the Homeland Security Committee unaniously approved this bill last week. I look forward to bringing the floor, where I hope it can be passed on a bipartisan basis. While our bill is pending, I hope my colleagues in the Appropriations Committee will once again be receptive to the letter and spirit of our bill to make those resources available to urban areas and others alike.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that the thousands of religious and other nonprofit institutions in Ohio and across the country are safe and welcoming places. I pray we will see the day when such security grants are not necessary because we will abide by the admonition to love our neighbors as ourselves. But in the meantime, let’s do what we can to give our communities the know-how, the resources, and the best practices so they can be safer and more secure.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

FISCAL CHALLENGES

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his outstanding comments on faith-based security and the immigration crisis that we are facing and the solutions he suggested. We have a lot of work to do there.

Now you get to hear from the accountant.

I come to the floor today to call attention to the Federal Government’s unsustainable fiscal outlook.

Yesterday in the Senate Budget Committee we had a hearing on fixing our broken budget and spending process, with a focus on securing our country’s fiscal future. Our witness was the Comptroller General of the United States, the head of the Government Accountability Office.

In April of this year, GAO issued its third annual update on the nation’s fiscal health. The report concluded that the Federal Government is on an unsustainable fiscal path.

In a Congressional Budget Office report released this week on the long-term budget outlook painted a similarly bleak picture, noting that our surging Federal debt is putting our Nation at risk of a “fiscal crisis.” This is one of the charts we got to see. I know it is pretty hard for people to read. We are figuring out a way to make this bigger.

The impact will be tremendous. It shows that, in 2019, Social Security spending passed the $1 trillion mark for the first time. In 2021, the highway trust fund will be unable to meet all obligations. In 2022, the discretionary spending caps will expire, allowing unlimited spending. In 2025, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation multiemployer fund will be depleted. It will be insufficient to pay full benefits to insolvent pension plans. In 2025, CBO projects the net interest spending will surpass the spending on national defense. In 2026, the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund will be depleted. By the time the incoming revenue, it will be sufficient to pay 91 percent of hospital-related Medicare spending, which is already forced to be low.

In 2030, the net interest spending will exceed $1 trillion annually. The interest will exceed $1 trillion annually.

In 2031, mandatory spending and interest will consume all Federal revenue. It means we will not get to make any decisions on anything that isn’t mandatory, which we don’t get to make decisions on right now.

In 2032, the Social Security trust fund will be depleted. The amount of money coming in that will be paid out right away will only pay 77 percent of the scheduled benefits. I will cover that more later.

Those are a few of the fiscal cliffs we are facing that could be solved now, that have to be solved now. If they are solved now, they have simpler, less painful problems than if we wait until the cliff gets here.

The Federal Government is swimming in a sea of red ink that threatens to drown America’s future generations. If current laws don’t change, debt as a percentage of GDP will soar to unprecedented levels over the next 30 years. Let me repeat that. If current laws don’t change, debt as a percentage of GDP—that is production—will soar to unprecedented levels over the next 30 years. By 2032, our debt-to-GDP ratio—this debt-to-production—will surpass the historical records set in the aftermath of World War II. By 2049, debt will stand at 144 percent of GDP.
That is how bond investors determine the likelihood of getting their money back. Interest rates reflect that fact and go up as risk increases. As that percentage goes up, the risk increases. The amount we have to pay to borrow any money will go up, if people still loan us money, which gets us to what is on the chart.

In 2030, net interest will exceed $1 trillion a year annually. That is not buying anything; that is paying the interest.

In most of the Nation’s history, we have only seen periods of high spending and debt during wars and other emergencies, and the increase has been temporary, but today’s fiscal situation is different.

We are facing a demographic fiscal storm. For decades, nonpartisan experts, including the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office, have warned of the budget pressures that we would face as baby boomers aged and began to retire. We heard yesterday from the GAO that, on average, more than 10,000 people per day turn 65 years of age, and in the next few years, that number will rise to more than 11,000. Here is a little chart of how those thousands per day grow.

Some of us were under the impression, not too long ago, that the baby boomers eventually would die. That is kind of an inevitable sort of thing. What we didn’t count on was the extra longevity that everybody will have and the fact that there are other generations coming up. So the chart does not tail off here on the end. The chart continues to grow, even though the birth rate is down.

The combination of aging population, longer lifespans, and rising per-beneficiary healthcare costs has put enormous pressure on our spending.

According to the CBO, the projected explosion in debt we will see over the next few decades and beyond occurs because of mandatory spending—particularly Medicare and Medicaid—not to mention the interest payments on the national debt that will permanently grow faster than Federal revenues.

ThisAutospent money—spending that is never looked at—has already grown from about 36 percent of the Federal budget 50 years ago to 70 percent today. If left unchecked, CBO projects that more than 80 cents of every dollar the government spends will be on mandatory spending, guaranteed to be spent without further approval, not to mention the interest by 2039.

Because mandatory spending operates on autopilot, not subject to the annual appropriations process, it often escapes congressional scrutiny and proper oversight. It would be one thing if mandatory spending programs by-passed the appropriations process because they were fully funded through their own dedicated source of revenue, but that is not the case.

As this chart shows, many of the largest mandatory programs, such as Medicaid and food stamps, don’t have their own source of funding and instead rely entirely on money from the Treasury’s general fund. You can see the blue here. That is money that will be used to buy anything; that has to be spent to meet the obligations. On some of these, you will note that there is no blue at all. That means this is coming out of the general fund, which is where we expect to be able to pay for it, notfund the money that has to be spent to meet the obligations.

Even though some of these programs do collect some revenue—and a few of them do collect their own revenue—they often spend more than they take in. It didn’t used to be the case. We used to have a lot more people working and paying into Social Security than were receiving Social Security, and there used to be a huge surplus, which we spent and then put as bonds in the drawer. We are now drawing down on those bonds, even though there is no real money to back them up, but that is about to be depleted as well.

Over the next 10 years, CBO projects that Social Security spending will total $14.4 trillion, but the program’s dedicated tax revenues will only cover $11.8 trillion of that. That is $14.4 trillion going out and $11.8 trillion coming in. You can’t do that very long.

CBO projects that under current law, Social Security’s combined trust funds would be exhausted through 2032. You may say: That is a long time into the future, 2032. Well, that is 3 years earlier than the Social Security Trustees estimated just earlier this year. How many times can we have that accelerated by 3 years before we are at the cliff?

Total Medicare spending will amount to $11.5 trillion over the next 10 years, but the program just collects $6 trillion in dedicated taxes and premiums—again, $11.5 trillion going out and $6 trillion coming in.

CBO and the Medicare trustees both projected Medicare’s Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, which covers inpatient hospital services, hospice care, skilled nursing facilities, and home health services, will be depleted in 2026.

Spending on military and civilian retirement programs will total nearly $2 trillion, but Federal employees’ contributions toward their pension will only be $70 billion. I don’t like that word “trillion.” It is kind of hard to wrap your head around it. Billions are tough enough, but $2 trillion is $2,000 billion. That is what is going out, $2,000 billion. What is coming in is $70 billion. There is a little bit of a gap. Just as with the tax programs, this difference will be made up with general fund revenues, which today are all borrowed funds.

Social Security and much of Medicare is supposed to be different though. Under current law, once their respective trust funds are exhausted, those programs will still pay out money, but they will only be able to pay out as much in benefits as they have coming in. That is where the Government Accountability Office that, for Medicare, that means only being able to pay 91 cents on the dollar for hospital-related Medicare spending. How long do you think doctors will put up with that? How many hospitals will close that put out of business? For Social Security, revenue is projected to be sufficient to cover only 77 percent of scheduled benefits. Who on Social Security will be able to afford a cut of 23 percent? That is the fiscal cliff.

Of course, this shouldn’t be news to lawmakers. For years, the warnings that these programs are on an unsustainable fiscal course have gone largely unheeded, hoping that the next generation would be more willing to deal with the problem.

To be clear, I want to make sure Social Security and Medicare are able to continue providing benefits to current beneficiaries, as well as those who may need these programs in the future. That will require us to work together in a bipartisan manner to ensure these programs’ solvency. If we don’t make changes to the way these programs currently operate, not only can the $11.5 trillion going out and $6 trillion coming in. You can’t do that very long.

Ignoring the problem will not make it go away and, in this case, the opposite is true. The longer we wait to address this imbalance, the more severe the changes will need to be, and we will have fewer options.

We need to change the way we do things around here. Too often we wait to make the difficult decisions that everyone knows has to be made until we have a crisis on our hands. In the Budget Committee, we are focused on trying to put together bipartisan budget process reform proposals that will help us confront these thorny fiscal issues in a more reasoned, timely, and responsible way.

I am hopeful we will get there. I am encouraged with the conversations we have had that we will get there. These issues are too important to ignore, and we are going to need to work together if we are to put our lot of people in a more sustainable fiscal course. We owe it to future generations to try.

We have handled some crises around here. Recently, we handled one of national disasters. The national disasters don’t have to be paid for. They aren’t a part of the budget caps—they should be a part of the budget caps, but they don’t have to be a part of the budget
caps—so they just get exempt as long as they are voted on, but everybody wants to help everybody with a problem, so we go ahead and pass those straight to debt. One week, at the beginning of the week, when we proposed it, it was $15 billion. When it actually passed it, it was $19.1 billion. That all went to additional debt.

It is a crisis. We need to plan for it. We need to prioritize for it. We need to fit that in, but we can’t do everything. We need to continue to escalate everything, and consider that things we haven’t looked at for years are OK to keep doing the same way we are doing them or to have the duplication. We are doing hearings all the time on ways this problem can be solved, but it is important that we start solving it soon or future generations will be drastically affected.

In fact, the dates I had up here earlier, present generations will be affected. We need to get everyone on board looking for solutions and biting the bullet now to do them.

I have had a penny plan for a long time. Under the penny plan, if we just stopped spending 1 cent out of every dollar we spend, not counting Social Security, no change in Social Security, no change in Social Security—well, ways to do things 1 percent better, and we did that for 7 consecutive years, our budget would balance. If we started with a penny, I am pretty sure we would say: That really didn’t hurt too bad. How about if we do 2 cents? Now we cut it back to 4 years, and we can start paying down debt, which we have to do for our future generations, if our kids and grandkids are going to have the kind of life we had.

I am working for and hoping for everybody working together to solve these problems. If we just talk about them, and we don’t work on them, it is pretty depressing but not as depressing as it would be hurting.

I ask my colleagues to take a look at this and help come up with solutions. I am impressed with those who are working with me on it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Enzi). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I sit here every Thursday from 3 o’clock to 6 o’clock and hear several speeches that are made. I happen to sit on the Budget Committee with Chairman Enzi. I hope everyone listened carefully to what he just said. The Comptroller General was in yesterday.

One of the reasons I ran for Senate is that being a Main Street entrepreneur from Indiana, you never could have gotten by with the way this place runs its business. The Federal Government is somewhere around six to seven times the size of Walmart and runs its business by the seat of its pants, in the sense that we have not done a budget that we have appropriated in nearly 20 years.

If you listened closely, you know we have some hard deadlines. The chairman referred to it as cliffs. Well, sometimes that is so figurative that you don’t believe it is going to happen or that it is going to be real. These are things we are going to have to contend with.

When the Medicare fund is depleted fully in 2026, benefits get cut immediately. Social Security is further down the trail, and there are going to be all kinds of issues. We are lucky, currently, that other countries and our own citizens will lend us money when we run trillion-dollar deficits routinely.

He mentioned the “Penny Plan.” In any business, if you were charged with fixing your company’s problems by cutting back by either freezing expenses by a 1-percent cut or a 2-percent cut, that would be done easily because you have hard accountability. If you would perform in a business or a State government like we do here, I can guarantee you there wouldn’t be a lender that would let you perpetuate and keep doing it. The fact that we have a credit card that we can put it on year after year eliminates the accountability that you have anywhere else.

I was on a school board for 10 years. I was in State government in Indiana, where we always have a cash balance and operate in the black and have a balanced budget. Even though we do that so routinely here, we passed a balanced budget amendment to our State constitution simply because government, even in a place like Indiana, oftentimes views how they spend the people’s money different, and this place does it better than any other place in the country.

So do we want to get to the point where we deplete the Medicare trust fund and where we run out of funds to pay pensioners or do we want to make the hard decisions?

It is funny. When I got here, I looked at the budget process. Budgets, even though they are not adhered to, might be a resolution, and it is not the law. Always, even if they do incorporate something, if it is the U.S. Open. After the win, Gary thanked our troops for their service and stated: “There’s men and women who sacrifice and do so much for us so I can go out and play a game of golf and live my life under freedom.”

Gary’s performance at Pebble Beach was truly elite. He scored under par in all four rounds, including an impressive 6-under-par 66 in the second round. On Sunday’s final round, Gary battled the elements and a late surge by last year’s U.S. Open champion, Brooks Koepka. On hole 16, Gary sunk a long birdie putt to solidify his win at 13 strokes under par, 1 stroke better than Tiger Woods’ historic 2000 U.S. Open victory at Pebble Beach.

I congratulate Gary on this historic win, but I also recognize his actions off the course. Gary is an advocate for Special Olympics and also partners with Folds of Honor, a nonprofit organization that grants scholarships to family members of U.S. servicemembers. Gary even wore patriotic golf gear to honor our troops and Folds of Honor.

The final round also coincides with Father’s Day, and this undoubtedly made this championship even more significant as Gary’s father watched him sink the final putt on 18. Gary said, after his win, that his dad worked nights so he could pursue his love of sports and spend time with him during the day.

I recognize Gary, but I also want to recognize the entire Woodland family—
is to preemption laws in States that substantially exceed this standard.

The right to organize shouldn’t depend on whether or not your State has robust worker protections, like the State of Hawaii, and workers shouldn’t be held captive to the pro-union bent of the Roberts Five on the Supreme Court.

The fight to protect the right to organize is not an abstract issue. Unions have lifted people into the middle class, especially women and people of color. I speak from personal experience. When I was a young child, my mother worked for years in low-wage jobs that provided no job security, no healthcare, and no stability. We lived paycheck to paycheck. That all changed when my mother and her coworkers organized and formed a union. That union happens to be the CWA.

Unionization brought job and economic security to their family. Our public employee unions are fighting on behalf of millions of people across our country who are serving our communities. They are our teachers, our firefighters, social workers, EMTs, and our police officers. They are us.

These are not normal times. We all need to come together to fight back against an all-out assault on working people. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I want to first of all thank Senator HIRONO for introducing one of the most important bills this session. It is all about collective bargaining rights. It is all about workers’ voices being heard and all about the dignity of work.

Just last week I was with Senator HIRONO with a number of her constituents from her State, and they talked about support for manufacturing or especially her support for workers. I was particularly pleased when she mentioned the Communications Workers of America. I have staff with me on the floor—some of my Ohio staff, including my State director, who came out of the CWA. I know how important workers’ rights are. So I thank Senator HIRONO for introducing this bill. If we did nothing this session but pass that legislation, it would be a huge victory for workers.

Unfortunately, we have a Supreme Court that puts its thumb on the scales of justice in every case, choosing corporations over workers, choosing Wall Street over consumers, choosing, in far too many cases, health insurance companies over sick people. And today’s Supreme Court case is aimed and targeted directly at States like mine, Ohio, a State that is a swing State and has 12 Republican House Members, and has had that same configuration of 12 and 4 for 4 State elections because of redistricting. But it is no surprise, with the Supreme Court deciding that they were
going to put their thumb on the scale of justice again, against voting rights, against civil rights. That is what has happened in support of corporate money.

So dark money has affected the special-interest Supreme Court. We have never had a Supreme Court in my lifetime that is this beholden to corporate interests, that is this beholden to billionaire contributors, that is this beholden to special interests. We have never seen a Court like this.

What does this mean? It means that instead of citizens choosing their elected officials, it is politicians choosing whom they represent. That is why you get these districts that will stay 12-to-4 Republican, where voters have no real say in these elections because of the way it is lined up.

We have a Supreme Court that is hostile to voting rights, hostile to worker rights, hostile to women’s rights, hostile to LGBTQ rights. That is what this Supreme Court has given us, as Senator McConnell, in his office down the hall, continues to push judges like this who don’t look toward the public interest. They are always looking toward rewarding their billionaire contributors.

Again, I thank Senator Hirono for her work. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 386

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, an important and bipartisan piece of legislation on which I have been a proud sponsor and on which I have been proud to work with Senator Harris to bring this bill to fruition.

It has been many years in the making, and I am pleased to stand behind this legislation and to push it forward. There is no question that immigration is one of the most important and also politically fraught and politically charged issues in front of Congress right now. More often than not, we can’t even seem to agree on what the problems in our immigration system are, let alone come to an agreement about how best to solve them.

That makes it all the more important for us at least to come together to get something done in those areas where we can find common ground and do so across party lines on issues that are neither Republican or Democratic, neither liberal or conservative, but that are simply American issues that are central to who we are.

We are great as a country not because of who we are but because of what we do, because of the fact that we choose freedom, we choose to be welcoming, and choose to be that shining city on the hill, where anyone can come into this country, be born or immigrate into this country as a poor person, and hope and have the reasonable expectation that one day, if they work hard and play by the rules, they might have the opportunity to retire comfortably, in some cases wealthy.

We have to find common ground in these areas. The Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act is an important point of common ground.

Employment-based immigration visas—the one significant area of our immigration system based on skills and based on merit—are currently issued in accordance with rigid, arbitrary, antiquated, and outdated per-country quotas. This means that in a given year, immigrants from any one given country cannot, in most cases, be given more than 7 percent of the total number of visas allocated. As a result of this, immigrants from nations with large populations have significantly longer wait times to get a green card than do immigrants from smaller countries. In some cases, they could be stuck in a backlog of green card petitions for decades.

This makes no sense. This is arbitrary. It is capricious. It is unfair. It is un-American. It is not what we do. This is one of the many features of our immigration code that are outdated and need to be cast into the dustbin of history. These per-country visa caps cause serious problems for good people, for American businesses and American workers alike. They cause unfair, undue, and immense hardship for the immigrants who happen to be unfortunate enough to be stuck in that very backlog.

While employment-based green cards are supposed to go to immigrants with high skills who will help grow the American economy, the per-country caps distort this system by causing some immigrants to wait years before receiving a green card for a reason that may be the system is completely detached from their qualifications. This undermines our ability to bring the best and the brightest individuals to our country. It is to our harm, and it is to our own shame.

Further, the per-country caps force the immigrants that are stuck in this backlog—95 percent of whom are already inside the United States—to make the difficult choice between, on the one hand, returning to their countries and waiting decades for a green card, or on the other hand, leaving and taking their talents to a country that provides a fairer process for allocating legal immigrant status as a worker.

The Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act would accomplish, and that is exactly what this bill is all about.

Without the per-country caps, our skills-based green card system would operate on a first-come, first-served basis, ensuring that immigrants are admitted into the United States purely based on merit rather than on the arbitrary, outdated, unreasonable basis of their country of origin. This, after all, is what the American dream has often been about. It is about who we are as a people rather than where our parents came from, who they were, what they looked like, and what language they might have spoken.

This reform would also ensure that the hardships caused by decades-long wait times would be eliminated.

Importantly, the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act also contains critical safeguards to ensure that the transition from the per-country cap system to a first-come, first-served system would occur smoothly and without unduly disrupting existing immigration flows. Specifically, this bill includes a 3-year set-aside of green cards for immigrants who are not in the backlog to ensure that they can continue to enter the country as we process backlog petitions.

In addition, the bill contains an important “no backhanded” provision to make certain that green card applicants who are at the front of the line now will stay at the front of the line and not be faced with new delays as we work through the backlog during this transition process. These provisions will ensure that we are truly treating all immigrants in the employment-based system fairly.
For many years, this critical legislation was stalled because of the concerns of some Members that any reform to the employment-based visa system should be accompanied by new protections against fraud and abuse in the H–1B program. To address objections to these concerns, I negotiated an amendment to the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act with Senator Grassley to include new protections for American workers in how we process applications for H–1B visas. This amendment, negotiated with Senator Grassley does three things: First, the Grassley amendment would strengthen the Department of Labor’s ability to investigate and enforce labor condition application requirements. In addition, it would reform the labor condition application process to ensure complete and adequate disclosure of information regarding the employer’s H–1B hiring practices. Finally, it would close loopholes by which employers could otherwise circumvent the annual cap on H–1B workers.

Importantly, the Grassley amendment—like the underlying bill itself—consists of provisions that have long enjoyed support from Members of this body. Many of the ideas of this amendment emanate from both sides of the aisle and from every point along the ideological spectrum. They are drawn from an H–1B reform bill that has been championed both by Senator Grassley and by Senator Durbin.

I am grateful that Senator Grassley was willing to come to the table and work in good faith on achieving a reasonable compromise on this bill. I believe the deal we have struck is a fair and evenhanded way to address long-standing concerns about our H–1B system while eliminating country-of-origin discrimination in how we allocate skills-based green cards.

The reason the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act enjoys such broad support and bipartisan support is because it does not include any of the typical partisan poison pills and other controversial provisions that so often undermine and in many cases doom other immigration reform efforts. This is a narrow, surgical reform—one that is necessary, one that is palatable, and one that is long overdue.

I would like to conclude by thanking Senator Harris, who has been an indefatigable partner with me on this bill. I have been proud to work side by side with her to eliminate the country-of-origin discrimination and bring about a system of fairness in how we allocate employment-based green cards.

This is an important and, indeed, essential immigration law and one that has been a long time coming.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 365 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the Grassley amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. Paul. Reserving the right to object, I have offered a modest compromise amendment to this legislation. I stand ready and open to negotiate and discuss this. We have often discussed it in private and in public. I will object until we can get to negotiating terms, and we can hopefully pass this bill once we enter into a dialogue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Object is heard.

Mr. Lee. Mr. President, I approach with great sadness and disappointment the response just brought about by my distinguished colleague, my friend, the junior Senator from Kentucky. This is a narrow, fatigable partner with me on this bill. The reforms to which my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky, refers are themselves born of a genuine desire to improve our immigration system. But, alas, the reforms he has proposed are not, in my view, compatible with the scope of this bill, nor are they compatible with something that can reasonably pass through this body. That is one of the reasons I have introduced the legislation as I have.

I worked on this nearly the entirety of the 8½ half years I have had the opportunity and great privilege to serve the people of Utah in the Senate. This is by far the closest we have ever come to having a deal, and we achieved that deal by keeping the focus of this bill on the things this legislation deals with.

The suggestions that Senator Paul has made, while born of great concern for our country and a noble degree of commitment to serving the people of his State, are not themselves compatible with the scope of this legislation, nor are they compatible with what would likely be passed by this body.

We have an opportunity right now to pass this. This could pass this body right now. I find it greatly disheartening to see my colleagues and my friend has chosen not to allow this to pass this body today. This is something that could and should and otherwise would pass this body today without that objection.

I would respectfully but with all the urgency I am capable of communicating implore my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, to reconsider his objection and allow this to pass.

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. Udall. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 883 TO S. 1790

Mr. Udall. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up Udall amendment No. 883.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Udall), for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 883 to S. 1790, as amended.

Mr. Udall. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as amended, is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit unauthorized military operations in or against Iran)

SEC. 1226. PROHIBITION OF UNAUTHORIZED MILITARY OPERATIONS AGAINST IRAN.

(a) In General.—No funds authorized by this Act may be used to conduct hostilities against the Government of Iran, against the Armed Forces of Iran, or in the territory of Iran.

(b) Rule of Construction.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

(1) to restrict the use of the United States Armed Forces to defend against an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces;

(2) to limit the obligations under the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.); or

(3) to affect the provisions of an Act or a joint resolution of Congress specifically authorizing such hostilities that is enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. Udall. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. Udall. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Udall. Mr. President, I rise to respond to some of the criticisms of the Udall amendment that I believe are misleading and deserve a response.

To start, I want to point out an area of agreement. The opposition says our amendment is simple, and it agrees on its intent—that this amendment would prohibit a war with Iran without there being congressional approval, and that is what the vote is about. The arguments from those in the opposition mislead to avoid that simple truth. They are trying to create excuses for why we should ignore the Constitution and open the door to war with Iran without having a vote.
Trump has said he was 10 minutes away from doing just that. Here is some of what we have heard. Critics say we only have one Commander in Chief, not 535, and so we should not pass this amendment.

We only have one Commander in Chief, but the Commander in Chief executes wars. Only Congress can declare them. Our Founders made that decision for good reason. Dictators and Kings have a history of using democracies don’t. In our democracy, the people decide whether we go to war or whether we don’t go to war through their elected representatives. Congress is the most direct voice of the people. Once that decision has been made, then it is up to one Commander in Chief to execute that war. The people of New Mexico did not send me here to be a battalion commander or a general, and I have no intention of acting like one. The people of New Mexico sent me here to do my constitutional duty, and article I, section 8 vests the power of the legislative branch in Congress.

Our amendment expressly states that the President cannot authorize military action without our declaration of war. If there is a national security crisis that requires Congress to vote on war, then we must have a vote. A majority leader said our amendment defines “self-defense” too narrowly. I am confused at what he is referring to. Our amendment does not include a separate definition of “self-defense.” Our amendment expressly states that it does not restrict “the use of the United States Armed Forces to defend against attack.” This language does not, and cannot change the Department of Defense’s rules of engagement that guide how to exercise our inherent right of self-defense. The DOD does not require a unit to absorb an attack before it can defend itself, and neither does our amendment.

The only restriction in the amendment is that the President cannot enter into hostilities without having congressional approval. It is a restriction that Congress is in the habit of using. If the Republicans are proposing to do away with that restriction, I agree with my colleague Senator Merkley that they must come to the floor and propose a constitutional amendment to do so.

Our forces in Iraq, Bahrain, and other locations in the Middle East are fully capable and empowered to defend themselves, and this amendment does not affect that. Unfortunately, the opposition is just repeating itself, trying to get a reaction to abdicate its own constitutional duty.

We have also heard criticism that this amendment is “appeasing the Ayatollahs” and represents “weakness” and that we must allow the President to launch an attack on Iran. We have heard these kinds of arguments before. They were very common in the run up to the disastrous Iraq war. Do not question the arguments for war. To do so is to be weak. I could not disagree more.

Our Constitution is our strength, and this amendment simply reaffirms our Constitution in the face of a President who is threatening to flout it. Our Nation is strong when we are united. We do not need to give up congressional authority over war and peace to one man, the President, in order to be strong.

Congress has authorized military action before, and when majorities believe that the circumstances warrant it, Congress will do so again. If we fear Iran so much that we are willing to walk away from the constitutional requirements to authorize military action, that would be the real sign of weakness.

We have also heard that we cannot rely on Congress to authorize force if we need it to. We heard that Congress can barely name a post office. So how can we trust it with this kind of decision? What if Congress is out of town and cannot vote?

First, it is disappointing to hear Members of the Senate speak so cynically about our duty during a debate as important as this. The Congress does not function perfectly. That is very true. Yet history is clear that Congress has authorized military force many times in the past. I have supported some of those decisions, but we had debates and votes. Only recently has the 2001 authorizing been so abused to authorize military action all over the globe—far beyond the al-Qaeda and Afghanistan mission that Congress thought it was voting on.

Congress, though, has had these debates and has voted, and those decisions represent our national decisions. I see no reason to turn our back on our Constitution just because Iran is a regional threat and this administration has manufactured a crisis to exacerbate that threat.

If there is a national security crisis that requires Congress to vote on military force, then it must come to Washington and do our jobs. Maybe we will even have a vote on Friday. Congress voted after Pearl Harbor, and Congress voted after 9/11. Both were in the middle of national crises. Our troops will be the ones making real sacrifices. We can bear the cost of some inconvenient recess travel. Our job is to debate and vote on matters of war and peace—period, end of story.

We have also heard that the Department of Defense is opposed to our amendment.

Yesterday, Mr. John Rood, the Under Secretary for Policy at the Department of Defense, sent a letter to the leaders of the Armed Services Committee in its opposition to our amendment. The letter is short, and while it contains speculation and rhetoric, it includes no legal analysis and fails to address the plain language of the amendment or longstanding DOD authority or rules of engagement.

I am disappointed in the letter, but it should not be a surprise from a political appointee from the Trump administration, not when the President is openly declaring that he needs no authority from Congress to launch a war against Iran. The letter reads that the amendment “purports to limit the President’s authority in discharging his responsibility as Commander in Chief,” which is simply false.

The amendment straightforwardly affirms the constitutional authority of Congress to authorize military action—authority that the President is openly flouting in his public comments.

Congress authorizes military action against Iran, the Commander in Chief would be free to execute it.

The letter asserts, without evidence, that our amendment will embolden Iran. I hope we are not so weak that we think our Constitution emboldens Iran.

Overall, the letter cites nothing—the Constitution, no law, no DOD policy, no legal analysis, nothing—in support of its claims.

This letter from DOD, which lacks a confirmed Secretary, is a disingenuous attempt to cast doubt on our amendment, but it should not be read as any authoritative take on this amendment, its intent, or its effect.

Some have said that this amendment would block the United States from helping Israel defend itself from an Iranian attack. I support Israel’s right to defend itself, and this argument does not hold up.

First, this amendment has no impact on our ongoing security assistance and cooperation with Israel, including the recent MOU signed with Israel by President Obama.

Second, if Israel is attacked, there is nothing in this amendment that would prohibit the United States from coming to its aid with defensive measures.

Third, if Israel is attacked and the United States wants to send our military to engage in direct hostilities, we are going to need to debate and authorize any response in Congress. That is simply what the Constitution says. The authorization of military action is critical to avoiding the risk of Iranian attacks on Israel, according to one Israeli Cabinet Minister last month, is the escalating tension between the United States and Iran.

The best thing we can do to protect Israel is diplomacy to stop a broader regional war in the Middle East. If the United States does go to war with Iran, Israel is likely to face very serious threats, and that is something we should take seriously if we consider the use of force.

Israel’s Energy Minister Yuval Steinitz said in May that “things are heating up” in the Persian Gulf. He said:

If there’s some sort of conflict between Iran and the United States, between Iran and its neighbors, I’m not ruling out that they will activate Hezbollah and Islamic Jihad from Gaza, or even that they will try to fire missiles from Iran at the State of Israel.

So the threats to Israel from Iran only make it more important that we have a full debate and vote on military action, not less important.
Again, the purpose of our amendment is simple: The President is threatening to launch military action against Iran without authorization, publicly flouting Congress. This amendment says that we are not going to go into an unauthorized war with Iran.

If the President and Members of this body think we need to take military action against Iran, then let’s have that debate and let’s vote.

The Udall amendment ensures we follow the constitutional process. To do otherwise is to be in dereliction of our constitutional duty.

Mr. ROMNEY. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. UDALL. The Senator from New Mexico yields the floor.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the perspective and sincere thoughts and ideas coming from my good friend from New Mexico.

The Senator indicated that those who are arguing are trying to create excuses for why we should ignore the Constitution. I would note that in my remarks this morning I noted specifically that this is not an authorization to use military force against Iran or anyone else. It is a statement of continued commitments to our national defense, and, precisely, it is saying that under the Constitution only Congress may declare war. That is something I said specifically.

But the Senator goes on to note—he says that only Congress—specifically, his words are “ignore the Constitution, open the door to war with Iran without a vote.”

President Trump has said he was 10 minutes away from doing just that. Is the Senator saying that if the President were to do what he was contemplating, and that is to take out missile batteries with the potential of the loss of life of as many of 150, but also it could be with a prewarning, with no loss of life, but taking out missile batteries that have fired upon an American aircraft—unmanned American aircraft—if he were to have done that in response to their shooting down an aircraft in international airspace, that constitutes going to war and would have required a vote of Congress to authorize shooting down or attacking missile batteries that have fired rockets at an American airship.

I am referring to the Senator’s comments succinctly, and I will read the entire point.

The Senator said: “They are trying to create excuses for why we should ignore the Constitution and open the door to war with Iran without a vote.”

President Trump has said that he was 10 minutes away from doing just that.

So in the Senator’s view, is responding in a very limited manner, as he was contemplating, taking out missile batteries potentially—would have constituted going to war and required the vote of Congress.

That is my question, because I believe that is not the case. I believe the President has the constitutional authority and duty to respond, if necessary, in an appropriate way to return fire on the very batteries that have shot down an American aircraft. I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO BLAIR BREITTSCHNEIDER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to tell you about two young women from Chicago who made together that has helped to transform the lives of hundreds of other young women.

Domiitira Nahishaklye moved with her family from the African nation of Burundi to Chicago. Three years later, she found herself overwhelmed.

At 18, she was attending high school, trying to prepare for college, and caring for her three younger siblings. Under the constitutional process, it could be with a prewarning, with no loss of life, but taking out missile batteries with the potential of the loss of life of as many of 150, but also it could be with a prewarning, with no loss of life.

Fortunately, Domi met another young woman named Blair Brettschneider.

Blair grew up in Detroit. After graduating from the University of Miami in Florida, she had hoped to become a journalist, but the Great Recession caused Blair to rethink her career path. She moved to Chicago to work for AmeriCorps VISTA, sometimes called the domestic Peace Corps. Blair was a “gofer” for the refugee resettlement agency.

Not content with coffee runs and other “busy work,” Blair started talking to the families her agency was helping. That is how she met Domi.

Blair started to tutor Domi and help her with her homework at the after-school center. The responsibilities made it difficult for her to attend the sessions regularly.

Rather than give up, Blair started tutoring Domi at her home. She helped her master her studies and apply for college. She also helped Domi adapt to life in her new homeland.

Blair realized that Domi was not alone. Many immigrant girls and young women Blair spoke with shared the same needs, and many refugee agencies just weren’t set up to help them.

That realization led Blair to establish a foundation in 2011 to provide other young women refugees in Chicagoland with the same types of support that Blair offered Domi. It is called GirlForward. It has since expanded its reach to help young women in Austin, TX, as well.

Since 2011, GirlForward has helped nearly 300 refugee women in the Chicago area and in Austin find jobs, friends, support, and encouragement in America.

Amina Imran, a refugee from Pakistan, is one of those fortunate young women. She used to joke that the only way she could attend college is if she robbed a bank, but after finishing the Chicago GirlForward program in 2017, she now attends North Park University in Chicago, on a scholarship.

GirlForward is recognized as one of the best charities in Chicago. Reader’s Digest declared GirlForward the Best of America.

My visits to GirlForward in Chicago were some of the happiest moments on my schedule. Young women from every corner of the world found self-confidence and encouragement with their peers. The processes of assimilating language and culture were lifted as these amazing young women came together and shared their struggles and joys.

In helping young women refugees to thrive in their new home, Blair Brettschneider is following in the footsteps of another great Chicagoan. In 1889, Jane Addams founded Hull House on the Near West Side of Chicago. It was one of America’s first settlement houses, where new citizens could acquire domestic and job skills and learn about American Government and customs. For her work with Hull House and other social justice causes, Jane Addams became the first American woman ever to receive the Nobel Peace Prize.

GirlForward is a new version of Hull House.

In July, Blair will be leaving GirlForward. Fortunately, she leaves the GirlForward programs in Chicagoland and in Austin in strong shape.

On behalf of the hundreds of young women whose lives GirlForward has helped enrich and transform and the hundreds of young women who will follow them, I want to thank Blair Brettschneider for her remarkable work and wish her all the best in her new efforts.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss Senate amendment No. 861, offered by my colleague from Utah.

The author of the amendment, Senator ROMNEY, and others have made clear that this language does not constitute an authorization of the use of military force, or AUMF. I agree with that assessment.

While this amendment appears to restate existing Presidential authority to defend the country in the event of an attack, it includes other language that could be interpreted to provide more authority to the President. That concerns me, which is why I voted against this amendment.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, amendment No. 861 fully captures the utter failure of the modern Congress to assert and defend congressional war powers that the U.S. Constitution solely vests in the legislative branch. It treats matters of life and death as mere fodder for political ‘‘gotcha’’
votes and represents an approach to legislating that is ultimately as simplistic as it is dangerous.

If one asked 10 attorneys to analyze the text of amendment No. 861, one might very well receive 10 wildly different interpretations of what the undefined terms in the amendment mean, from the use of the term “attack by the government, military forces, or proxies of a foreign nation or by other hostile forces” to the phrase “used to ensure the ability of the Armed Forces of the United States to defend themselves, and United States citizens.”

As the authors plausibly argue, the intent of the amendment may very well be to simply reaffirm existing legal interpretations and norms that authorize the U.S. Armed Forces to defend itself and our citizens against attack by a foreign nation or other hostile force. As supporters argue, the amendment avoids using the specific phrase “authorization for the use of military force,” and thus one may argue that it is technically not an “AUMF.”

Yet adopting such an interpretation requires ignoring years of executive branch overreach when it comes to taking unilateral military action without seeking an authorization for use of military force or a declaration of war from Congress.

It requires willfully forgetting the behavior of our current President and past Presidents of both parties, who have chosen to define the concept of Commander in Chief under Article II of the U.S. Constitution to be less of a commander and more an emperor while the legislative branch has sat idly by as its war powers were rapidly seized by the modern imperial Presidency.

Congress is a coequal branch of government. It is time we started acting like it. We cannot trust any President to take a blank check and fill in a reasonable number. I must oppose amendment 861 because, in my reading, any President of any party would adopt the broadest interpretation possible in defining what constitutes an “other hostile force” or an “attack” or what it means to “ensure the ability of the Armed Forces of the U.S. to defend themselves.”

This language risks unintentionally authorizing President Trump to order all types of military strikes against any number of potential entities that the President deems to be a threat. How will an administration determine the precise baseline that defines the term “ability” of the military to defend itself? Would allowing the degradation of any platform or capability qualify as failing to “ensure the ability of Armed Forces to defend itself?” If so, that would authorize the use of funds in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 to take unilateral, preemptive action against a foreign nation or hostile force to preserve the current capabilities of the U.S. military.

I am confident the author of this amendment would disagree with this interpretation of his legislative language. However, would the sponsor argue that such an interpretation is unreasonable or not possible? Would a Federal Court not defer to the Federal Agency’s interpretation of a vague and ambiguous statute? I do not know the answer to these questions, yet I know this: I am not willing to take that risk.

We are living with the consequences of a previous Congress that rushed to pass a concise authorization for use of military force against a ill-defined target and limited at first. We have watched as Republican and Democratic administrations alike subsequently employed creative and broad legal interpretations of that authorization to continually expand which parties were connected with the horrific terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

To this very day, the Trump administration cites this authorization for use of military force as legal justification to unilaterally deploy Americans all over the world, and it was authorized in response to an event that took place before some of these troops were even born. To be clear, I am not asserting that I oppose the premise or substantive motivation of every military action that took place under the recent Presidential administrations. I am simply stating that such actions must be debated and voted on by Congress.

I deployed to fight in a war I personally opposed because it was ordered by the Commander in Chief, and these orders were pursuant to an authorization for use of military force that was publicly debated and passed by a majority of our Nation’s elected representatives. Opposing a vaguely worded amendment whose own author and proponents assert is duplicative and unnecessary and which I believe may intentionally open the door to unlimited unilateral military action, ultimately is a vote to make the President more accountable, and a more perfect union in living out the principles contained in our founding document.

Critics may falsely allege that opposing amendment No. 861 is voting against our national defense and military. I will strongly reject any such ridiculous claim that slanders me with the accusation that I would ever risk the security and safety of the Nation I have proudly served in uniform. In voting against amendment No. 861, I am not safeguarding our military from excessive use without congressional oversight. I am simply making clear that we, in Congress, must begin exercising the same care and attention in doing our job as our troops do when executing their missions downrange.

One of my primary motivations for serving the great State of Illinois in the U.S. Senate is to help restore congressional war powers. To remind my colleagues that whether or not they favor military action, or oppose the use of military force, every Member of Congress should agree that such matters deserve to be debated and carefully considered by our Nation’s duly elected representatives in the broad light of day. To remind my colleagues that we must always demand the Commander in Chief clearly outline our desired strategic end state before authorizing military action that puts our troops in harm’s way.

The bottom line is that only Congress has the power to declare war. We are the ones tasked with deciding when and how we send Americans into combat. We are the ones the Constitution charges with that power.

For too long, too many elected officials have avoided the responsibility and burden of declaring war. Fearing electoral risks and staring down coming elections, multiple Congresses have shirked their constitutional responsibility to our troops by refusing to repeal the existing authorization for use of military force, while avoiding consideration any new authorizations for use of military force. Enough—enough—enough—we must be the change. We must take matters into our own hands.

We need to do better by our servicemembers. We owe it to them to live up to their sacrifice by ensuring that no American sheds blood in a war Congress has not authorized, or unintentionally authorized by passing vague language such as in amendment No. 861 that can be twisted to be reading empower President Trump to take preemptive military action.

We should be disciplined in forcing any President who wishes to go to war to bring their case to Congress and give the American people a vote through their elected representatives. That is how we truly respect our servicemembers and military families: by demanding debate that is honest and clear-eyed about the likely loss of life and the risks of escalation that accompany any use of force. It is our duty, and it is the least we can do for those willing to risk their lives in safeguarding our democracy, our way of life, and our Constitution.

So with the drums of war beating louder and louder by the day, I must oppose amendment No. 861 and keep my promise to all who served or are serving now in defense of this country we love. I must continue seeking to hold all of us who have the honor of serving in Congress accountable for taking back congressional war powers. Moving forward, I urge the leadership of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees to work with me to strike or significantly restrict this language during the conference negotiations that will take place over the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020.

LOWER HEALTH CARE COSTS ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my opening statement at the Senate
Committee be printed in the RECORD.
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There are other proposals:

For example, banning anti-competitive terms in health insurance contracts that prevent patients from seeing other, lower-cost, providers. The Wall Street Journal identified dozens of cases where anti-competitive terms in contracts between health insurers and hospital systems increase premiums and reduce patient choices.

Banning Pharmacy Benefit Managers, or PBMs, from charging employers, health insurance plans, and patients more for a drug than the PBM paid to acquire the drug, which is known as “spreading price.”

Eliminating a loophole allowing the first generic drug to submit an application to the FDA and block other generic drugs from being approved.

Provisions to improve care for expectant and new moms and their babies.

Provisions to make it as easy to get your personal medical records as it is to book an airplane flight.

And provisions to incentivize health care organizations to use the best cybersecurity practices to protect your privacy and health information.

I hope we will today vote to approve this legislative package so we can present it to Majority Leader McConnell and Minority Leader Pelosi, and encourage the full Senate to consider next month and would expect that other committees will have their own contributions.

Since January, Senator Murray and I have been working in parallel with Senator Grassley and Senator Wyden, who lead the Finance Committee.

They are working on their own bipartisan bill, which we look forward to markup this summer. The Senate Judiciary Committee is marking up bipartisan legislation on prescription drug costs tomorrow. And in the House, the Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Judiciary Committees have all reported out bipartisan bills to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

Secretary Azar and the Department of Health and Human Services have been extremely helpful in reviewing and providing technical advice on the various proposals to reduce health care costs.

And the president has called for ending surprise billing and reducing the cost of prescription drugs. The Administration has also taken steps to improve transparency for families and employers so they can better understand their health care costs. The Lower Health Care Costs Act is just one example of this Committee reaching a result on a difficult issue.

We did that with fixing No Child Left Behind, with the 21st Century Cures Act, with user fee funding for the Food and Drug Administration, and most recently, with our response to the opioid crisis that included input from 72 senators of both political parties.

We reached those results in the midst of the argument Congress has been locked in for the last decade about where six percent of Americans get their health insurance.

Especially for Americans without subsidies, health insurance has gone way too expensive. But the reality is we will never have lower cost health care insurance until we have lower cost health care.

That is why I am especially glad that 65 senators, including nearly every member of this Committee, have worked together on the Lower Health Care Costs Act which takes steps to actually bring down the cost of health care that Americans pay for out of their own pockets.

### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

#### TRIBUTE TO TRENT CLARK

- **Mr. CRAPO.** Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator JAMES E. INHOEFEN, Representative SUHPSON, and Representative RUSS FULCHER, I congratulate Trent Clark on his upcoming retirement from the Bayer Corporation after 26 years of service. We have greatly enjoyed working with Trent and thank him for the service he has provided to the people of Idaho in both his official and individual capacities.

On behalf of Bayer, Trent has provided steadfast dedication to his responsibilities inherent as public and government affairs director. In that role, he has provided invaluable assistance to Bayer’s operations in Soda Springs, which are an integral part of the southeastern Idaho economy. Most notably, Trent has played a critical role in the effort to permit Bayer’s next phosphate mine, Caldwell Canyon, which has 40 years of estimated reserves and will be one of the world’s most environmentally sustainable mining operations, particularly in its approach to sustainability. Trent has also helped to further important company efforts to support our local communities, particularly their school systems, and to protect our environment. Additionally, for many years, Trent has worked in a collaborative manner with key stakeholders with a genuine humility and desire to achieve a positive outcome.

As an individual citizen, Trent has also provided excellent service to the people of Idaho in his capacity as chairman of the Idaho Workforce Development Council and as a member of the boards of the Idaho Humanities Council, Idaho Community Foundation, and the Idaho Association of Commerce and Industry. Trent’s prior public service includes 2 years as the State executive director of the Farm Services Administration, 3 years as chairman of the Idaho Republican Party, a year as staff to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, and 8 years as staff to former U.S. Senator Steve D. Symms.

Prior to joining Bayer, Trent graduated with honors from Brigham Young University, where he majored in political science and botany. He also earned an associate of arts degree from Ricks College in Rexburg, ID. After college, Trent worked as a botany instructor for the Yellowstone Institute, as well as an executive vice president for the Fox Creek Public Schools. In addition to Trent’s strong record of leadership and service to the community, Trent has served his family and church well. Trent has been married to the former Rebecca Lee since May 28, 1986, and together, they have four children: Brittany (deceased), Kai, Kathleen, Christin, and Alexander. Trent and his family enjoy horseback riding and backcountry hiking and camping. It is our sincere wish that Trent be blessed with many years of retirement with his family.

#### TRIBUTE TO TROY WITT

- **Mr. DAINES.** Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing Troy Witt, of Garfield County, for his selfless actions in helping those in need.

Troy, a rancher and commercial trucker of Sand Springs, spearheaded an effort to send much needed donations to farmers and ranchers impacted by record flooding in Columbus, NE, in March of 2019. He was inspired by Montana ranchers who came to the aid following the Lodgepole Complex fire, Montana’s largest fire of the 2017 wildfire season. After losing 85 percent of his ranch, Witt was overwhelmed by the outpouring of support and supplies he received from those he had never met.

When the opportunity presented itself, Witt decided to pay it forward. He planned to load up his 53-foot trailer with as much hay, fencing material, and feed and other supplies as he could and drive the 700 miles to the drop-off site in Columbus. After the Garfield County Disaster and Emergency Services echoed Witt’s plans, farmers from around Montana offered to donate supplies. His efforts helped bring hope to a region where hundreds had lost homes and businesses.

Witt’s act exemplifies the spirit of compassion and selflessness that Montanans embody. I and many others thank Mr. Witt for his good deed.

#### TRIBUTE TO CLYDE TERRY

- **Mrs. SHAHEEN.** Mr. President, today I wish to salute Clyde Terry for his many years of dedicated service and staunch advocacy on behalf of people with disabilities. Clyde is retiring from his longtime role as CEO of Granite State Independent Living, and he leaves a legacy worthy of our praise and our gratitude.

Granite State Independent Living—GSIL—is a nonprofit that breaks down barriers for seniors and people with disabilities and expands the training and support services available to them. Its mission is grounded in a firm belief that all people have a right to define their own level of independence. Under Clyde’s leadership, GSIL has blossomed into an essential statewide organization with a $17 million budget and several awards and accolades to its name, including Non-Profit of the Year Awards from Business NH Magazine, NH Business Review, and the Greater Concord Chamber of Commerce. Services range from providing respite to meet the aging, education, and employment challenges faced by so many across the Granite State.

Clyde has tapped into a wealth of experience to build GSIL into an expanding statewide organization that remains committed to its founding principles of personal choice and direction. Before his tenure at GSIL, he was...
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the executive director of the New Hampshire Developmental Disabilities Council, a State agency tasked with protecting the rights of our State’s most vulnerable citizens. While affiliated with the council, he coauthored a report outlining the challenges of locating in the United States and established himself as a national expert on election reform. He was also an administrative hearings officer in the State’s service systems, and before that, he helped to create and implement New Hampshire’s Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. Throughout his career, Clyde has shown a deep passion for improving the lives of the disabled, the aged, and the impoverished.

I was honored to recommend Clyde when a vacancy arose on the National Council on Disability in 2009. As a member of the council, he became a sought-after voice on the potential of autonomous vehicles to broaden a sense of independence among people with disabilities. He was also a force fighting for fair pay and equal treatment in the workplace. Clyde was eventually named chairperson of the council, a testament to his leadership and communication skills and his fluency on the broad set of issues in the disability community.

I have known Clyde for decades. We worked together on Gary Hart’s 1984 Presidential race. Though the campaign eventually ended in heartbreak, Clyde emerged from the race having met Susan, who would become his beloved wife of many years. As Governor of New Hampshire and U.S. Senator, I always appreciated Clyde’s guidance and counsel.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in thanking Clyde Terry for his years of service and advocacy and wishing him all the best in the years ahead.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 19:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3935. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1784. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Ethiprole; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9994–19–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1786. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of four (4) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1787. 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 “Air Plan Approvals; California, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District” (FRL No. 9994–19–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

H.R. 3351. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3401. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEASURES REFERRED

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. MCCONNELL).

EC-1789. 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 “Public Meeting Procedures of the Board of Regents, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences” (RIN0790–AK36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1790. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Regents, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 105th Annual Report of the Federal Reserve Board covering operations for calendar 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1791. 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 “Addition of Entities to the Entity List and Revision of an Entry on the Entity List” (RIN0694–AH86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1792. 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 “Addition of Entities to the Entity List” (RIN0694–AH86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1793. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the navigation improvements at San Juan Harbor, Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1795. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the navigation improvements at San Juan Harbor, Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1796. 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 Approvals; California, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District” (FRL No. 9994–19–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1797. 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 Approvals; California, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District” (FRL No. 9994–19–Region 9) received in
the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1798. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Emergency Authorization to Establish Emission Limitations for United States Steel-Gary Works” (FRL No. 9995–36–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1799. 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; KY; Attraction Plan for Jefferson County SO2 Nonattainment Plan” (FRL No. 9995–38–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1800. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Withdrawal of rules issued prior to June 28, 2016” (FRL No. 9995–62–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1801. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Change of Address for Region 1 Reports; Technical Correction” (FRL No. 9995–50–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1802. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Emergency Authorization to Establish Emission Limitations for United States Steel-Gary Works” (FRL No. 9995–36–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1803. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Repeal of the Clean Power Plan; Emission Limitations for Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Existing Electric Utility Generating Units; Revisions to Emission Guideline Implementing Regulations” (FRL No. 9995–70–OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1804. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Technical corrections to State Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPSA) regulations and disposal sites designated under the MPSA” (FRL No. 9995–28–OW) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1805. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OSTS–2019–0731) to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1806. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OSTS–2019–0731) to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1807. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, On-Site Implementation Assurance Program, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Operation Refined Fuel” (RIN0648–BF42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1808. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OSTS–2019–0731) to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1809. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Emergency Authorization to Establish Emission Limitations for United States Steel-Gary Works” (FRL No. 9995–36–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1810. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Change of Address for Region 1 Reports; Technical Correction” (FRL No. 9995–50–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1811. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “VA Acquisition Regulation: Special Contracting Methods” (RIN2900–AQ19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1812. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “VA Acquisition Regulation: Special Contracting Methods” (RIN2900–AQ19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1813. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Technical corrections to Stationary Activity Centers” (15 CFR Parts 1121, 1122, 1123, 1124, and 1125) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1814. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the rule entitled “Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard, MY 2018 High-Threat Light-Duty Truck and Exempted Vehicle Line Listing” (RIN2127–AL79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1815. 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 “International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fishery; Revised 2017 Fishing Restrictions for Tropical Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean” (RIN0648–BH12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1816. 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 “International Fisheries; The Exclusive Economic Zone of the Kingdom of the Netherlands; Gulf of Alaska, 2019 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish” (RIN0648–XF633) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 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:

WHEREAS, in 2002, Congress reauthorized the Farm Bill, which includes country-of-origin labeling for beef, lamb, pork, farm-raised and wild fish, peanuts, and other perishable commodities; and

WHEREAS, in 2005, the Montana Legislature passed the Country of Origin Placing Act until “funding and full implementation of federal mandatory country of origin labeling”; and

WHEREAS, in 2009, Montana’s country-of-origin labeling (COOL) laws were voided, as the federal act was implemented; and

WHEREAS, in 2015, federal COOL rules ceased being enforced for beef and pork products only due mainly to a World Trade Organization ruling; and

WHEREAS, consumers want to know the origin of their food; and

WHEREAS, American and Montana farmers and ranchers want consumers to know the origin of their food; and

WHEREAS, Congress should pass laws and the U.S. Department of Agriculture should administer rules and regulations for COOL certification for beef and pork products that do not impose undue compliance costs, liability, recordkeeping, or verification requirements on farmers and ranchers.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the 66th Montana Legislature urges Congress to pass a federal COOL law
WHEREAS, the United States, Canada, and Mexico entered into the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), trade among these countries tripled from $340 billion in 1993 to $1.2 trillion in 2016; and

WHEREAS, North American integration of trade under NAFTA has helped to make the United States more competitive in the world economy by providing highly integrated and valuable supply chains, as well as common rules and harmonized regulations that increase the speed and global competitiveness of one another’s businesses, and by driving investment and imbedding value in each others’ economic success, including by providing jobs in North American communities, and

WHEREAS, APR has petitioned to change the grazing allotments from seasonal or rotational grazing to year-round grazing and remove the interior fencing on those allotments; and

WHEREAS, the BLM has determined that the property and services against spousal impoverishment; to the Committee on Finance.

*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. CASEY (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1999. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide transitional Medicare coverage and retroactive Medicare part D coverage for certain low-income beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. KLOBUCAR):

S. 1001. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove an institutional bias by making permanent the protection for recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 2001. A bill to award the Presidential Gold Medal to Willie O’Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. ISAKSON, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. TUMulty):

S. 2002. A bill to require that any debt limit increase or suspension be balanced by equal spending cuts over the next decade; to the Committee on Finance.
the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. CRAMER):
S. 2715. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish insulin assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. CAPITO):
S. 2006. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain conduct relating to the use of horses for human consumption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WARREN, and Ms. MARKEY):
S. 2007. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from implementing a proposed rule regarding requirements for the Entity Planning and Development housing programs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STARKES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):
S. 2008. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GARDNER, and Ms. SMITH):
S. 2009. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to authorize a demonstration of a small business voucher program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. HEINRICHI):
S. 2010. A bill to increase research, education, and treatment for cerebral cavernous malformations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CRUZ):
S. 2011. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce the credit hour requirement for individuals enrolled in the Roddith Nourse Scholars STEM Scholarship program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BENTEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. RUBIO):
S. 2012. A bill to provide that certain regulatory actions by the Federal Communications Commission shall have no force or effect; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. LATINO):
S. 2013. A bill to protect the right of individuals to bear arms at water resources development projects; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARKKEY:
S. 2014. A bill to provide grants to States to encourage the establishment and maintenance of firearms licensing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):
S. 2015. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to develop a plain language disclosure form for borrowers of Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):
S. 2016. A bill to help individuals receiving disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act obtain rehabilitative services and return to the workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mrs. PFISCHER):
S. 2017. A bill to amend section 116 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. JONES):
S. 2018. A bill to provide Federal matching funding for Social-level broadband programs to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):
S. 2019. A bill to ensure Members of Congress have access to Federal facilities in order to exercise their Constitutional oversight responsibilities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):
S. 2020. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand the use of telehealth services for remote imaging for chronic eye disease; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER:
S. 2021. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act by striking marijuana use, possession, and distribution as grounds of inadmissibility and removal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORA (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):
S. 2022. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for improvements to the specially adapted housing program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOBVEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. KENNEDY):
S. 2023. A bill to certify the Federal and State Technology Partnership Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. COONS):
S. 2024. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the American History for Freedom grant program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):
S. 2025. A bill to amend the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 to modify the definition of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. COLINS):
S. 2026. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):
S. 2027. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the scope of the Advise and Consent Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARIDEN, and Mrs. CAPITO):
S. 2028. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for new markets and export incentives in the Rural Jobs Zone; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES:
S. 2029. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Indian coal production tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:
S. 2030. A bill to prevent Federal agencies from interfering with the marijuana policy in States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRASSO:
S. 2031. A bill to amend the FAST Act to allow States to use existing grants on small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans in reporting under the disadvantaged business enterprises program of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. KAIN, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. CRAMER):
S. 2032. A bill to expand the Rural Jobs Zone to the cannabidiol and marijuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. ISAIAS):
S. 2033. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate standards and regulations requiring all new commercial motor vehicles to be designed to use technology to limit maximum operating speed, to require existing speed-limiting technologies already installed in certain commercial motor vehicles to be used while in operation, and to require that maximum safe operating speed of commercial motor vehicles shall not exceed 65 miles per hour; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):
S. 2034. A bill to authorize small business development centers to provide cybersecurity assistance to small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):
S. 2035. A bill to require the Transportation Security Administration to develop a strategic plan to expand eligibility for the PreCheck Program to individuals with Transportation Worker Identification Credentials or Hazardous Materials Endorsements; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):
S. 2039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the issuance of exempt facility bonds for zero-emission vehicle infrastructure; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2041. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor; to the Committee on Banking, Hous- ing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KAINE, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2043. A bill to provide incentives for hate crime reporting, provide grants for State-run hate crime hotlines, and establish alter- native sentencing for individuals convicted under the Matthew Shephard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCALARY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 2044. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to establish an Agency Infrastructure Account, to amend the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978 to provide additional funds under that Act, to establish a review of flood control rule curves pilot project within the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Re-

ources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2045. A bill to reauthorize the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entre-

preneurship.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 2046. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to protect the health care benefits of retired public safety officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Af-

fairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2047. A bill to provide for a 2-week ex-

tension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 267. A resolution recognizing the September 11th National Memorial Trail as an important trail and greenway all individ-

uals should enjoy in honor of the heroes of September 11th; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. Res. 268. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federal Govern-

ment should not bail out any State; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. Res. 269. A resolution commemo-

rating the life of Luis Alejandro "Alex" Villamayor and calling for justice and accountability; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BENTNET, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MUR-

RAY, Mr. HOKKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CAR-

PELL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. FRIN-

STEIN):

S. Res. 270. A resolution recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Stonewall uprising; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. Res. 271. A resolution designating July 12, 2019, as “Collector Car Appreciation Day” and recognizing that the collection and res-

ervation of historic automobiles is an im-

portant part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. BLACKBURN, Mr. RUHOK, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Con. Res. 21. A concurrent resolution strongly condemning human rights viola-

tions, violence against civilians, and co-

operation with Iran by the Houthi movement and its allies in Yemen; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 110

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. Fischer) was added as a cosponsor of S. 110, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a permanent extension of the lower income threshold for the medical expense deduction.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Daines) was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancements in public safety services to Indian communities, and for other purposes.

S. 235

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 235, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to establish teacher leader development programs.

S. 239

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 239, a bill to require the Sec-

detary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. Udall, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to provide for the ad-

ministration of certain national monu-

ments, to establish a National Monu-

ment Enhancement Fund, and to establish certain wilderness areas in the States of New Mexico and Nevada.

S. 546

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 546, a bill to extend au-

thorization for the September 11th Vic-

time Compensation Fund through fiscal year 2099, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CHAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, supra.

S. 560

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 560, a bill to amend the Public Health and Retirement Security Act of 1996 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide cov-

erage for treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for dis-

ability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coins-

urance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of
whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 678

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 678, a bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. MARKET, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 684, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to combat international extremism by addressing global fragility and violence and stabilizing conflict-affected areas, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.

S. 851

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 851, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires employers within the health care and related services industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

S. 872

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 872, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign $20 Federal reserve notes so as to include a likeness of Harriet Tubman, and for other purposes.

S. 876

At the request of Mrs. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 876, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to prepare veterans for careers in the energy industry, including the solar, wind, cybersecurity, and other low-carbon emissions sectors or zero-emissions sectors of the energy industry, and for other purposes.

S. 1071

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) 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. 1227

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1227, a bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to study the rule of intermediaries in the pharmaceutical supply chain and provide Congress with appropriate policy recommendations, and for other purposes.

S. 1243

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKET), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors 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. 1392

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1392, a bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the responsibilities, workload, and vacancy rates of suicide prevention coordinators of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1413

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1413, a bill to provide for interagency coordination on risk mitigation in the communications equipment and services marketplace and the supply chain thereof, and for other purposes.

S. 1457

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1457, a bill to provide for interagency coordination on risk mitigation in the communications equipment and services marketplace and the supply chain thereof, and for other purposes.

S. 1488

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1488, a bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes.

S. 1531

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1531, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for health insurance consumers from surprise billing, and for other purposes.

S. 1623

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1623, a bill to promote the deployment of commercial fifth-generation mobile networks and the sharing of information with communications providers in the United States regarding security risks to the networks of those providers, and for other purposes.

S. 1737

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1737, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1769

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1769, a bill to clarify that noncommercial species found entirely within the borders of a single State are not interstate commerce or subject to regulation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 or any other provision of law enacted as an exercise of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

S. 1847

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1847, a bill to require group health plans that group or individual health insurance coverage to provide coverage for over-the-counter contraceptives.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) 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. RES. 252

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1866, a bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination based on source of income, veteran status, or military status.

S. RES. 252

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 252, a resolution designating September 2019 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

AMENDMENT NO. 506

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from
Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors 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. 703

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 703 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. 742

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 742 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. 883

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BROWN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 883 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.

STATMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CASEY, Ms. Duckworth, Mr. Durbin, Mrs. Feinstein, Mrs. Gillibrand, Ms. Harris, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Markey, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Reed, Ms. Rosen, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Schatz, Mrs. Shaheen, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Smith, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Van Hollen, Ms. Warren, Mr. Whitehouse, and Mr. Wyden):

S. 2008. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, half a century ago, members of the LGBTQIA+ community, who were tired of being accused and abused and assailed just because of who they were or whom they loved, took a stand to say “enough is enough” and pushed back against the forces of history that said they were anything less than equals. Thanks to the sacrifices of freedom fighters like Marsha P. Johnson, Sylvia Rivera, and so many others both named and unnamed who dared that day to live their entire truth, countless others today have been set free. Now, 50 years later, through dogged persistence and sacrifice, we have been able to pass laws and create policies that respect and protect members of the LGBTQIA+ community—from challenging hateful bans against lesbian and gay relationships, to securing landmark civil rights protections against hate crimes, to, finally, making marriage equality the law of our land.

This year, as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall protests that sparked the modern movement for LGBTQ equality, I am very proud to stand here on the floor of the Senate as an unapologetic ally for this vibrant community.

As we close out this month’s annual celebration of Pride, I come to the floor today to reintroduce legislation to protect gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, asexual, and gender nonconforming individuals from the dogma of our Nation’s homophobic and transphobic past because, even as we reflect on the progress we have made, we have a lot more to do to achieve equality.

In the Senate, I have been very proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with the community in Washington State and around the country to continue our progress and work to expand protections to help members of the community thrive, from our efforts to reduce bullying and harassment at colleges and universities through legislation named after Tyler Clementi—a student who tragically died by suicide in college—to reducing the epidemic of harassment and discrimination in workplaces through the Be HEARD Act, which is a bill I recently introduced that would hold businesses accountable to their employees for the discrimination, give workers the resources and support they need to seek justice, and clarify that discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity are unlawful under the Civil Rights Act.

I am very grateful to my colleague Senator BOOKER and our friend Representative LIEU for joining me today in reintroducing the Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act—the first Federal ban on so-called conversion therapy—because, in 2019, we know that being a member of the LGBTQIA+ community is sometimes the fraudulent treatment that requires medical treatment; rather, the politicians who say it is are on the wrong side of history.

In fact, we know that conversion therapy is a painful and discriminatory practice. The American Psychological Association has said it is “unlikely to be successful in changing someone’s sexual orientation” and would “involve some risk of harm” contrary to the principles of the National Alliance for Research and Practice of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity, as well as the American Psychiatric Association.

For years, I have been lobbying the Department of Health and Human Services to clarify regulations on so-called conversion therapy—because, after 50 years of struggle, as a nation, we have come to know that love is love and that love wins.

Hate crimes, to, finally, making marriage equality the law of our land.

The Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act is legislation that would classify conversion therapy as the fraudulent practice our communities and science know it is. It would clarify in our Nation’s laws that providing or facilitating or advertising such services is an unfair and deceptive practice, and it would ensure that Federal regulators and State attorneys general have the ability and authority to enforce this ban.

We have come far in our long battle for LGBTQIA+ equality, and I am ready to get to work to get this important legislation over the finish line because, after 50 years of struggle, as a nation, we have come to know that love is love and that love wins. However, after 50 years, we also know it gets better but only if we work to make it so.

From the horrors of the Pulse massacre, to the ever-climbing number of murdered African-American and Latinx transgender women, to President Trump’s transgenerd military ban, and the chilling fact that the administration is explicitly endorsing assaut on LGBTQIA+ rights, so many of the challenges that face the community today mirror the critical struggles they faced all those years ago at the Stonewall Inn. Like then, too many in the community are still threatened by even greater danger because they are also women, transgender, people of color, poor, and, the list goes on.
That is why this legislation and recognitions like Pride Month are so important. All month, I have been thrilled to see the photos from Pride celebrations back in Washington State—from Spokane, to Yakima, to Olympia—filled with so much cheer, resilience, and strength, only to return back here to Washington and argue in this Chamber about why we shouldn’t confirm people to judicial or executive posts who don’t believe in the full humanity and equality of so many of our family members, friends, neighbors, and coworkers.

It is obvious that this work is still very important, and we have it cut out for us, but I remain hopeful because I have seen how far we have come in just 50 years. By continuing to honor the righteous tradition of Marsha, Sylvia, and so many others by raising our voices against injustice and taking key steps like this legislation to make life easier and easier for new generations of LGBTQIA+ Americans, I know we will see even more progress in the next 50 years.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. JONES):

S. 2018. A bill to provide Federal matching funding for State-level broadband programs; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the American Broadband Buildout Act of 2019, or ABBA. This legislation would help ensure that Americans have access to broadband services at speeds they need to fully participate in the benefits of our modern society and economy regardless of whether they live in the largest cities or the smallest towns. I am delighted to be joined by my friend and colleague Senator DOUG JONES in introducing this bill.

Twenty-five years ago, when the internet was known as the World Wide Web, it was typically accessed through the web using their home phone lines via modems capable of downloading data at just 56 kilobits per second—too slow even to support MP3-quality streaming music. Today, the threshold for broadband service as defined by the FCC allows downloads at speeds nearly 500 times faster—25 megabits per second. At these speeds, Americans not only can watch their favorite movies on demand in the comfort of their very own home, but they can also participate in the global economy while working from home, upgrade their skills through online education, stay connected to their families as they age in place, and access healthcare through advanced telemedicine.

While the increase in broadband speeds has been dramatic and is encouraging, these numbers mask a disparity between urban and rural Americans. Nearly all Americans living in urban areas have access to the internet at speeds that meet the FCC’s broadband threshold, while one in four rural Americans does not. Similar disparities occur in terms of broadband adoption—the rate at which Americans subscribe to broadband service if they have access to it. According to the Pew Research Center survey last year, 22 percent of rural Americans don’t use the internet at home, compared to just 8 percent of urban Americans.

The bipartisan bill that we are introducing would help close the digital divide between urban and rural America by directing the FCC to provide up to $5 billion in grants to assist in building “last-mile” infrastructure in the least dense parts of the country. The bill also directs the FCC to provide grants to States and State-approved entities in building “last-mile” infrastructure to bring high-speed broadband directly to homes and businesses in areas that lack it. Let me briefly discuss a few key points about the bill that I would like to highlight.

First, projects that receive funding must be located in unserved areas where broadband is unavailable at speeds that meet the FCC standards. Second, and this is important—the bill requires that the matching funding be matched through public-private partnerships between the broadband service provider and the State in which the last-mile infrastructure project will be built. This means that States and their private sector partners will have “skin in the game” to balance the Federal commitment, ensuring that projects will be well thought out and designed to be sustainable.

Third, the bill requires that projects be designed to be “future proof,” meaning that the infrastructure installed must be capable of delivering higher speeds as broadband accelerates in the future. This will ensure that Federal tax dollars are used to help build a network that is strong enough to support us now and in the future without having to rebuild it every time technology advances.

Furthermore, the bill directs the FCC to prioritize the funding of projects in States that have traditionally lagged behind the national average in terms of broadband subscribers and are at risk of falling further behind as broadband speeds increase.

Finally, the bill provides grants for states and tele-deposited entities for digital literacy and public awareness campaigns, highlighting the benefits and possibilities of broadband service and helping to attract employers to rural parts of our country in which broadband services are lacking and yet are essential for a business’s success.

The key reason to do this is to address the disparity in the adoption rates I have already mentioned, which will help drive down the costs of the service and make it more affordable for everyone.

One broadband application that holds special promise for rural America is telemedicine. As a native of Aroostook County—the largest county by land area east of the Mississippi, with fewer than 70,000 residents—I know how important healthcare is to the vitality and even to the survival of rural communities. Often, these communities struggle to attract and retain the physicians they need to ensure their having access to quality care for their citizens. Broadband can help to bridge this gap by enabling innovative healthcare delivery in these rural communities.

In an example described recently in a recent letter from Lisa Harvey-McPherson at Northern Light Home Care and Hospice, they were able to use the internet and video technology to help support a patient who was living on an island off the coast of Maine—not as far as the seagull flies but hours away in travel time. Although the connection was very poor, the video enabled the hospice nurses to monitor the patient’s symptoms and provide emotional support to her family. As the author of that letter from Lisa Harvey-McPherson put it, “Our hospice team could be doing so much more with video and telemonitoring technologies if Maine had better connectivity.”

I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks, this letter from Lisa Harvey-McPherson be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, in closing, rural Americans deserve to enjoy the benefits of high-speed internet in the same way that urban Americans do, but a digital divide has arisen due to the simple fact that rural areas are more sparsely populated than urban ones and are therefore more expensive to serve. The bill that Senator JONES and I are introducing today would help to bridge this digital divide by funding future-proof broadband where it is needed most and giving a real boost to job creation in rural America.

I urge my colleagues to support our bill.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:


Senator SUSAN COLLINS, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of Northern Light Health member organizations and the patients we serve, I want to thank you for your support for the need to advance health care in rural Maine. Technology is an essential strategy to increase access to health care services in rural Maine. Northern Light Health is a technology leader in Maine. We provide a variety of telehealth services including cardiology, stroke, psychiatry, trauma, pediatric intensive care and in-home telemonitoring services state wide. As we work to expand opportunities for patients to receive health care services through technology we consistently encounter the challenge of inadequate (or absent) broadband capacity. Northern Light Health member organizations compete nationally to recruit specialists to Maine. Technology is often the only option to expand access to specialists in rural Maine.

The following Northern Light Health examples highlight technology opportunities
and the need to increase broadband speed and capacity in rural Maine.

Our hospice program cared for a patient on an island off Hancock County. Staff placed a tablet at the patient’s home and one with the hospice nurse. Because of the challenges of Island travel, it took hours to get to the home to manage and support the patient and her family. Broadband connection was very poor we were able to help with symptoms and emotional support using video technology. Our hospice team could be doing so much more with video and telemonitoring technologies if Maine had better connectivity.

At Northern Light AR Gould in Presque Isle, they are a pilot site for the telehealth virtual walk-in clinic. Those using the system within the pilot are amazed at the ease of access to a provider to ask those easy questions that keep patients out of the ED. If successful, in a broader roll-out, patients in local communities will have access to walk-in level care (colds, rashes, general health questions) without leaving their home via technology. This is important given the average age of the population and the difficulty of traveling roads during the winter months in Aroostook County. The fully expanding the telehealth virtual clinic is broadband capacity.

Broadband access is also a professional recruitment tool. Provider spouses have difficulty finding meaningful employment. Addressing rural broadband capacity will support remote work.

In Aroostook County we are also evaluating telepsychiatry services for the regional nursing homes. This will significantly increase access to psychiatric services which is in clinical demand. Connectivity is a foundational component of offering this service.

Our electronic health record has expanded access to individualized health information for our patients, connectivity is a barrier to patients accessing this important resource in rural Maine.

As we increase our electronic health record capacity providers are reliant on this technology as much as they are reliant on clinical tools like a stethoscope. In areas with broadband capacity challenges the providers spend time looking at buffering symbols on their screens for long periods of time in the day.

We appreciate the opportunity to share these examples with you and your staff as you explore Congressional solutions to Maine’s broadband challenge.

Sincerely,

Lisa Harvey-McPherson RN, MBA, MPPM, Vice President Government Relations.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. PERNUE, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. COFFMAN, of Kansas) S. 2032. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

In 2010, Congress passed the Healthy and Hunger-Free Kids Act, which reauthorized child nutrition programs and made healthy meal choices a reality for children nationwide. Far too many children and adolescents in the United States are overweight or obese, which puts them at risk for developing chronic health conditions later in life. One of the best ways to help students make healthy choices is to teach them about their food and how it is grown. Making that connection makes a difference. That is why I championed the inclusion of funding for a farm to school grant program, which was included in the Healthy and Hunger-Free Kids Act.

The Farm to School program has been tremendously successful and interest nationwide, and has awarded grants in all 50 states and the District of Columbia to support programs in more than 33,000 schools. Building upon the success of this program, I am glad to be joined today by Senators PERDUE, BROWN, and COLLINS in introducing the Farm to School Act of 2019. In years past, I have championed this important farm to school legislative effort with one of my dearest friends, Thad Cochran, who sadly passed away last month.

We all know that hungry children cannot learn. Studies have shown that healthy nutrition in a young person’s diet is crucial to cognitive ability and behavioral well-being. Food insecurity and obesity rates are still high in this country, resulting in poor health, and learning and behavioral difficulties at school. The school meal program has made tremendous strides in recent years not only that children have access to meals throughout the school day, but that those meals are nutritious. The Farm to School program has given children and schools across the country the tools to craft farm-fresh, healthy, and delicious meals that students enjoy.

The Farm to School grant program offers support to farmers and local economies, while teaching kids about nutritious foods and how they are grown. The program has a strong educational component, making our school cafeterias an extension of the classroom, giving students an opportunity to learn about nutrition, well-balanced meals, and even how to grow the food themselves.

In Vermont, I have seen first-hand how farm to school efforts have better connected children with the food in their cafeteria. Students participate in school gardens, sustainability projects, and taste tests for new school menu items. With the help of a USDA Farm to School grant, the Burlington School Food Project has created a partnership with a local Vermont beef processor and 100 percent of the beef served the last school year was locally sourced, and that will continue next year as well. Organizations in Vermont such as Vermont Food Education Every Day, Shelburne Farms, and the Northeast Organic Farming Association have been able to expand their programs to link more farms to the classroom throughout Vermont.

Farm to school is equally crucial to farmers and ranchers by opening another market to them to sell their locally grown and locally harvested goods. The program links the classroom with the farm to engage students in the importance of farming and contributing to the local economy. Every dollar spent on local food generates up to an additional $2.16 in economic activity.

This program is so popular among school and farmers alike that demand for grants far outpaces available funding. Since the program began in 2013, USDA has received more than 1,900 applications, but has only been able to fund 437 projects. The Farm to School Act of 2019 would build upon the success of the program and expand its reach by increasing the funding for the program to $15 million per year.

The bill also recognizes the importance of growing the program to include preschools, summer food service program sites, and after-school programs.

Ensuring children have enough food to eat is an issue that unites us all. There is simply no excuse that in the wealthiest, most powerful Nation on Earth people go hungry. Small changes in eating habits by children will result in lifelong health benefits for generations to come. The Farm to School program empowers children and their families to make healthy choices now and in the future. As the Senate begins considering reauthorizing the child nutrition bill this year, I look forward to including these improvements in the Farm to School program.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. KASICH, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 203. A bill to expand research on the cannabidiol and marihuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Cannabidiol and Marijuana Research Expansion Act with my colleagues.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that marihuana and its derivatives, like cannabidiol, commonly known as CBD, may be helpful in treating serious medical conditions. However, anecdotal evidence alone cannot be the basis for developing new medications. Rather, medication development must be based on science.

Unfortunately, marijuana research is subject to burdensome regulations which may unintentionally inhibit research and medication development.

The Cannabidiol and Marijuana Research Expansion Act will reduce these barriers without sacrificing security or enabling diversion. It will ensure that marihuana-derived medications are developed using strong scientific evidence, and provide a pathway for the manufacture and distribution of FDA-approved drugs that are based on this research.

First, the bill streamlines the regulatory process for marihuana research. Specifically, it requires the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to quickly approve or deny applications to manufacture and distribute CBD or marijuana and its derivatives, like cannabidiol, and establishes a process by which applicants may submit supplemental information, if necessary.
It also improves regulations dealing with changes to approved quantities of marijuana needed for research and approved research protocols. These improvements will eliminate lengthy delays that researchers encounter under current regulations.

Second, this legislation seeks to increase medical research on CBD. It does so by explicitly authorizing medical and osteopathic schools, research universities, practitioners and pharmaceutical companies to produce the marijuana they need for approved medical research. This will ensure that researchers have access to the material they need to develop proven, effective medicines. Once the FDA approves these medicines, pharmaceutical companies are permitted to manufacture and distribute them.

Third, the bill fosters increased communication between doctors and patients. Because it is a Schedule I drug, some doctors are hesitant to talk to their patients about the potential harms and benefits of using marijuana, CBD, or other marijuana derivatives as a treatment, for fear that they will lose their DEA registrations. Yet, if patients are using marijuana, they need the doctor’s expertise to correct the ineffective care they receive. That is why our bill authorizes these discussions to occur.

Finally, because existing Federal research is lacking, the bill directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to expand and coordinate research to determine the potential medical benefits of CBD or other marijuana-derived medications on serious medical conditions.

I have heard from many parents who have turned to CBD as a last resort to treat their children who have intractable epilepsy. Anecdotally, CBD has reduced seizures, delay that researchers encounter under current regulations.

without their doctors’ knowledge, it could impact the effectiveness of the care they receive. That is why our bill authorizes these discussions to occur.

But a common concern echoed in many of these conversations is that there is a lack of understanding about the proper delivery mechanism, dosing, or potential interactions that CBD or marijuana may have with other medications. Some also worry because these products aren’t well regulated or factory sealed, and often are labeled incorrectly.

Without additional research, our ability to adequately address these concerns is limited and uninformed.

The need for additional research, along with the need to increase the supply of CBD and marijuana for research purposes, was highlighted in the National Academy of Sciences report, titled “The Health Effects of Cannabis and Cannabinoids: The Current State of Evidence and Recommendations for Research.”

I firmly believe that we should reduce the regulatory barriers associated with researching marijuana and CBD. If and when science shows that these substances are effective in treating serious medical illnesses, we should enable products to be brought to the market with FDA approval. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2036. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide grants to States for summer employment programs for youth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate’s attention to the Youth Summer Jobs and Public Service Act of 2019 that I am introducing today with my colleague from Maryland, Senator VAN HOLLEN. This legislation authorizes the Department of Labor to award Summer Employment for Youth grants to connect youth with jobs that serve their local communities and private businesses over the summer months.

Since the mid-1990s, my home city of Baltimore has organized the Youth Works program out of the Mayor’s Office of Employment Development. The Youth Works program provides individuals between the ages of 14 to 21 with a summer job with employers ranging from non-profit community nonprofit organizations, to city and State government agencies throughout the City. At these summer jobs, participants are provided with meaningful work experiences, are able to learn to develop the attitudes and grit necessary to compete in the workforce, gain exposure to a variety of career fields, and have a safe, stable environment over the summer months during the day. For the 2019 Youth Works session that begins next week, Baltimore employers in the program will have a job for five days a week, five hours per day from July 1st through August 2nd and be paid a minimum of $10.10 per hour for their service.

This program has grown to be one of the largest youth summer employment programs in the Nation. After the unrest in my home city in April 2015, the Federal Department of Labor provided the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation and the Baltimore City’s Mayor’s Office of Employment with a $5 million grant to develop innovative job training strategies and work opportunities for youth and young adults across Baltimore. This Federal grant enabled the number of individuals able to be served by the Youth Works program from an historic average of 5,000 participants to the more than 8,000 served today. Last year, Youth Works provided 8,600 Baltimorean businesses, local government agencies, and philanthropic ventures, more than 5,000 Baltimore City youth who sought summer employment will be denied the opportunity to gain experience in the workplace, foster confidence that they are capable of being successful in a new environment, and lose the security of a safe environment over the summer. We can and must do more to help individuals willing and eager to start their careers.

The Youth Summer Jobs and Public Service Act would seek to eliminate the waiting list for youth seeking to participate in Youth Works or other summer employment programs around the Nation. If enacted, my legislation would allow States to compete for Summer Employment for Youth grants to serve communities like Baltimore that have high concentrations of eligible, low-income youth. The grants would be utilized by local communities to carry out programs like the Youth Works program that provide summer employment opportunities that are directly linked to academic and occupations learning by providing meaningful work experiences. States competing for grants would be required to partner with private businesses to the extent feasible and to prioritize jobs and work opportunities that directly serve their communities, such as through summer employment with local community nonprofit organizations and city and State government agencies. This Federal funding would allow programs such as Youth Works and allow other communities across Maryland to establish their own programs and develop Maryland’s next generation of workforce.

As I am proud to lead this Senate effort with my colleague from Maryland and appreciate the work of Representative CEDRIC RICHMOND of Louisiana who initially led this effort in the U.S. House of Representatives and will shortly introduce companion legislation this Congress. I urge my Senate colleagues to join with me in this effort to connect youth with summer employment opportunities and start their journey towards fulfilling, successful careers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objections, so ordered.

S. 2036

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
This Act may be cited as the "Youth Summer Jobs and Public Service Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. GRANTS TO STATES FOR SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR YOUTH.

Section 129 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3164) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) GRANTS TO STATES FOR SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR YOUTH.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, from the amount appropriated under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Labor may award grants to States to provide assistance to local areas that have high concentrations of eligible youth to enable such local areas to carry out programs described in subsection (c)(1) that provide summer employment opportunities for eligible youth, which are directly linked to academic achievement and employment opportunities for eligible youth described in this Act.

"(2) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f)(1) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid to the Secretary by the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc., in support of the mission of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc., including capital improvements to the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor facilities.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2042. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record. "There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2042

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Purple Heart Hall of Honor Commemorative Coin Act".

SECTION 2. FINDINGS.
The Congress finds the following:

(1) The mission of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor is—

(A) to commemorate the extraordinary sacrifice of members of the United States who were killed or wounded by enemy action; and

(B) to collect and preserve the stories of Purple Heart recipients from all branches of service and across generations to ensure that all recipients are represented.

(2) The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor was dedicated on June 11, 2021, in New Windsor, New York.

(3) The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor is colocated with the New Windsor Cantonment Historic Site.

(4) The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor is the first to recognize the estimated 1.600,000 servicemen of the United States wounded in action representing recipients from the Civil War to the present day, serving as a living memorial to their sacrifice by sharing their stories through interviews, artifacts, and the Roll of Honor, an interactive computer database of each recipient enrolled.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall mint and issue the following coins:

(1) $5 GOLD COINS.—Not more than 50,000 $5 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 26.73 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.50 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(2) $1 SILVER COINS.—Not more than 400,000 $1 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 26.73 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.005 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent silver.

(b) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act there shall be—

(A) a designation of the value of the coin;

(B) an inscription of the year "2021"; and

(C) inscriptions of the words "Liberty," "In God We Trust," "United States of America," and "E Pluribus Unum".

(c) MINT FACILITY.—Only the West Point Mint may be used to strike any particular design and issuing of the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc.; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—

(B) to collect and preserve the stories of Purple Heart recipients from all branches of service and across generations to ensure that all recipients are represented.

(2) The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor was dedicated on June 11, 2021, in New Windsor, New York.

(3) The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor is colocated with the New Windsor Cantonment Historic Site.

(4) The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor is the first to recognize the estimated 1.600,000 servicemen of the United States wounded in action representing recipients from the Civil War to the present day, serving as a living memorial to their sacrifice by sharing their stories through interviews, artifacts, and the Roll of Honor, an interactive computer database of each recipient enrolled.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall mint and issue the following coins:

(1) $5 GOLD COINS.—Not more than 50,000 $5 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 26.73 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.50 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(2) $1 SILVER COINS.—Not more than 400,000 $1 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 26.73 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.005 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent silver.

(b) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act there shall be—

(A) a designation of the value of the coin;

(B) an inscription of the year "2021"; and

(C) inscriptions of the words "Liberty," "In God We Trust," "United States of America," and "E Pluribus Unum".

(c) MINT FACILITY.—Only the West Point Mint may be used to strike any particular design and issuing of the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc.; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated proof condition.

(b) MINT FACILITY.—Only the West Point Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) PAYMENT.—The Secretary may issue coins minted under this Act only during the 1-year period beginning on January 1, 2021.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the face value of the coins;

(2) the surcharge provided in section 7(a) with respect to such coins; and

(3) the cost of design and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge of—

(1) $35 per coin for the $5 coin;

(2) $10 per coin for the $1 coin; and

(3) $5 per coin for the half-dollar coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f)(1) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid to the Secretary by the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc., in support of the mission of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc., including capital improvements to the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor facilities.

(c) AUDITS.—The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc. shall be subject to the audit requirements of section 5134(f)(2) of title 31, United States Code, in order to ensure that the amounts received under subsection (b).

(d) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5134(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as of the enactment of this Act). The Secretary of the Treasury may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2047. A bill to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2047

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 223(d)(3) of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 1396w–1(b)(3)) is amended by striking "June 30, 2019" and inserting "July 14, 2019".

SEC. 2. MEDICAID IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 194(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w–1(b)(1)) is amended by striking "$6,000,000" and inserting "$1,000,000".

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 267—RECOGNIZING THE SEPTEMBER 11TH NATIONAL MEMORIAL TRAIL AS AN IMPORTANT TRAIL AND GREENWAY.

Mr. TOOHEY (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. Res. 267

Whereas September 11th, 2001, is the date of one of the worst terrorist attacks on United States soil, claiming nearly 3,000 lives at the Natural Memorial Trail as an Important Trail and Greenway.
SENATE RESOLUTION 268—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT BAIL OUT ANY STATE

Mr. COTTON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the September 11th National Memorial Trail is a biking, hiking, and driving trail that provides a physical link between the 3 memorials:

(1) commemorates the life of United States citizen Luis Alejandro "Alex" Villamayor;

(2) the Federal Government should take no action to redeem, assume, or guarantee any debt, including pension obligations, of a State; and

(3) returns south, following important sections of the East Coast Greenway and connecting the 9/11 Memorial Garden of Reflection to the trail;

That it is the sense of the Senate:

(1) the Federal Government should take no action to redeem, assume, or guarantee any debt, including pension obligations, of a State; and

(2) the Federal Government should not authorize Federal funds to be expended on behalf of creditors of a State.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 27, 2019

S. Res. 268

Whereas Alex Villamayor was murdered on June 27, 2015, in the City of Encarnación in Paraguay;

Whereas Alex Villamayor's death was wrongfully ruled a suicide by Paraguayan authorities before a comprehensive investigation was carried out;

Whereas, in the initial weeks of the investigation in Paraguay, authorities opened a formal investigation of Alain Jacks Díaz de Bedoya related to Alex Villamayor's murder;

Whereas, in October 2015, Paraguayan authorities opened a formal investigation of Alain Jacks Díaz de Bedoya for his role in Alex Villamayor’s murder;

Whereas, in November 2016, Paraguayan authorities dropped the charges against Alain Jacks Díaz de Bedoya related to Alex Villamayor’s murder;

Whereas, in December 2017, the United States Embassy in Asunción, Paraguay, has offered such assistance to Paraguayan authorities;

Whereas, in February 2017, outgoing United States Ambassador Leslie A. Basset told media outlets that Alex Villamayor “died under dark circumstances” and that “the investigation and the handling of this case has been worrisome”; and

Whereas, in April 2018, René Hofstetter was convicted of homicide and sentenced to 12 years in prison and Mathias Wilbs was sentenced to two years and 10 months on obstruction of justice;

Whereas, in spite of these convictions, media outlets report that others implicated in the murder and cover-up have not been charged, and

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate—

(1) the Federal Government should take no action to redeem, assume, or guarantee any debt, including pension obligations, of a State; and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury should report to Congress any negotiations to engage in actions that would result in an outlay of Federal funds on behalf of creditors of a State.

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) the Federal Government should take no action to redeem, assume, or guarantee any debt, including pension obligations, of a State; and

(2) the Senator from Pennsylvania be requested to introduce a resolution to commemorate the life of Luis Alejandro "Alex" Villamayor and calling for justice and accountability.

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas United States citizen Luis Alejandro "Alex" Villamayor was born on July 3, 1998, to parents Puning Luk Villamayor and Luis Felipe Villamayor in Rockville, Maryland;

Whereas Alex Villamayor is remembered by his family as a smart, loving, and compassionate young man with a good sense of humor, who was committed to his parents, siblings, and community;

Whereas Alex Villamayor moved with his family at the age of six to Paraguay, where he was a devoted member of his church and always had attention for those less fortunate;

Whereas Alex Villamayor graduated with honors from Paraguay’s Pan American International School (PAIS) and was accepted to attend Montgomery College in Maryland in the Fall of 2015;

Whereas Alex Villamayor aspired to study business and move to Paraguay to pursue a career that would help and support the Paraguayan people;
and offers condolences to his family and friends;
(2) expresses profound concern about the delays in achieving justice in Alex Villamayor’s case;
(3) urges Paraguayan authorities to invite the Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide technical assistance to properly investigate the circumstances surrounding Alex Villamayor’s death and assess whether other individuals may have had a role in the crime or cover-up;
(4) calls on the Government of Paraguay to provide for the physical security of Alex Villamayor’s family and others seeking justice in this case and to properly investigate recent threats to their lives, charging those implicated in such threats;
(5) calls on the Department of State to prioritize justice for Alex Villamayor in its diplomatic engagement with the Government of Paraguay; and
(6) calls on the Department of State to review its procedures for providing services to the families of United States citizens slain or assaulted abroad.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to an exemplary young Marylander whose life was tragically cut short just over four years ago today. Senator VAN HOLLEN and I have just introduced a resolution which pays tribute to Alex’s life, calls for justice and accountability in his murder, and procedures to ensure other families do not suffer the same tragedy.

Luis Alejandro “Alex” Villamayor was born on July 3, 1998, to parents Puning Luk Villamayor and Luis Felipe Villamayor in Rockville, Maryland. Those who knew him refer to him as a smart, loving, and compassionate young man with a good sense of humor. Alex was committed to his parents, siblings, and friends. He was a devoted member of his church and always sought to help those less fortunate.

Alex Villamayor moved with his family to Paraguay at the age of six. He attended high school there and graduated with honors from the Pan American International School and was accepted and agreed to:

...
equality, and well-being for LGBTQ individuals; and
(3) commends the bravery, solidarity, and resiliency of the LGBTQ community in the face of violence and discrimination, both past and present.

SENATE RESOLUTION 271—DESIGNATING JULY 12, 2019, AS “COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY” AND RECOGNIZING THAT THE COLLECTION AND RESTORATION OF HISTORIC AND CLASSIC CARS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF PRESERVING THE TECHNOLOGICAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. Res. 271

Whereas many people in the United States maintain classic automobiles as a pastime and do so with great passion and as a means of individual expression;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the effect that the more than 100-year history of the automobile has had on the economic progress of the United States and the unprecedented contribution of the auto industry to the United States economy;

Whereas the collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity shared across generations and across all segments of society;

Whereas thousands of local car clubs and related businesses have been instrumental in preserving a historic part of the heritage of the United States by encouraging the restoration and exhibition of classic automobiles;

Whereas the collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity that can provide well-paying, high-skilled jobs for people in all 50 States; and

Whereas automobiles have provided the inspiration for music, photography, cinema, fashion, and other artistic pursuits that have all 50 States; and

well-paying, high-skilled jobs for people in related businesses have been instrumental in shared across generations and across all segments of society.

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 12, 2019, as “Collector Car Appreciation Day”;

(2) recognizes that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to engage in events and commemorations, such as Collector Car Appreciation Day, that create opportunities for collector car owners to educate young people about the importance of preserving the cultural heritage of the United States through the collection and restoration of collector cars.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21—STRONGLY CONDEMNING HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS, VIOLENCE AGAINST CIVILIANS, AND COOPERATION WITH IRAQ BY THE HOUTHI MOVEMENT AND AFFILIATES IN YEMEN

Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Con. Res. 21

Whereas, in 2014 and 2015, the Houthi movement, also known as Ansar Allah, and its allies attacked Yemen’s internationally recognized government and seized control of the capital, Sana’a, and the port city of Aden;

Whereas, since 2015, the Houthis have expanded their armed campaign beyond Yemen to threaten cities to the north and south in Saudi Arabia and possibly beyond, including hundreds of missile and drone attacks against civilians in Saudi Arabia that have killed innocent civilians;

Whereas the Houthi movement’s slogan is, “God is great! Death to America! Death to Israel! Curse upon the Jews! Victory to Islam!”;

Whereas al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria—Yemen Province have taken advantage of the Yemeni civil war to expand their territory and resources;

Whereas Iran and its proxies have provided direct financial, material, and logistical support to the Houthis for at least a decade;

Whereas the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen has found that Iran is in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2216 (2015) for supplying the Houthis with missiles and drones;

Whereas the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait is the world’s fourth-largest transit point for oil shipments;

Whereas, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

Whereas, in October 2016, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

Whereas, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

Whereas, on October 8, 2018, the Houthis missile hit a Turkish-flagged ship carrying wheat to a Yemeni port;

Whereas the United States warned on February 10, 2019, that approximately 24,000,000 people in Yemen are in need of humanitarian assistance and protection, with most living in territory currently held by the Houthis;

Whereas the United Nations also estimates that 7,400,000 people in Yemen are in need of treatment for malnutrition, including 2,000,000 children under age five;

Whereas according to Human Rights Watch, the extensive use of land mines by the Houthis has killed and maimed hundreds of civilians in communities from their crops, clean water, and humanitarian aid;

Whereas, on June 21, 2019, the World Food Program announced that it was partially suspending aid to parts of Yemen controlled by the Houthis because of interference with food distribution and aid convoys and the misappropriation of food by Houthi officials;

Whereas Reporters Without Borders estimated that, as of March 2019, at least 16 journalists were being held hostage by the Houthis in Yemen; and

Whereas, according to Houthi media, the Houthis executed following years of torture and starvation;

Whereas, according to Human Rights Watch, the Houthis have undertaken a deliberate campaign of kidnapping, torture, and abuse against students, human rights defenders, political opponents, and religious minorities;

Whereas Houthi missile and drone attacks on June 12, 2019, and June 23, 2019, killed 1 civilian and injured 47 others at Abha International Airport in southern Saudi Arabia;

Whereas, according to United States Central Command, on June 6, 2019, a Houthi surface-to-air missile shot down a United States MQ-9 Reaper drone over Yemen, demonstrating a new Houthi capability that United States Central Command assessed was enabled by Iranian technology;

Whereas, on December 18, 2018, a cease-fire took effect in the port of Hodeidah, Yemen, which is the entry point for 70 percent of humanitarian aid in the country;

Whereas the Houthis did not begin removing their forces from Hodeidah and two other ports, part of phase one of the December 2018 ceasefire and withdrawal agreement agreed to in Stockholm, Sweden, until May 2019;

Whereas according to the United Nations monitoring mission in Hodeidah, the Houthis have not removed many Iranian installations and equipment from the port cities as of June 12, 2019; and

Whereas, on June 24, 2019, the United States, United Kingdom, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates released a joint statement that raised concerns that Iranian activities were destabilizing both Yemen and the broader region, reaffirmed support for the efforts of United Nations Special Envoy Martin Griffiths, and called on all parties in Yemen to accelerate implementation of the Stockholm agreement; Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns the Houthi movement in Yemen for—

(A) its blatant disregard for human rights and innocent life;

(B) its ideology of hate toward Israel and Jewish people both in Yemen and around the world;

(C) preventing critical humanitarian aid from reaching people in Yemen;

(D) the targeting of international commerce in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait; and

(E) missile and drone attacks against civilians;

(2) expresses concern about Iran’s extensive support for the Houthis and the economic and security consequences for the region of Iranian foothold on the Arabian Peninsula;

(3) urges the Houthis and other parties in the Yemeni civil war to uphold the terms of the December 2018 ceasefire and withdrawal agreement agreed to in Stockholm, Sweden; and

(4) urges the United States Government to support a peace process to end the civil war and humanitarian crisis in Yemen while preventing Iran and terrorist groups, including al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria—Yemen Province, from gaining a permanent foothold on the Arabian Peninsula.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 904. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. HOEVEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 50, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional
fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes.

SA 905. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. Hoeven) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 212, to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 904. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. Hoeven) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 50, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 3, line 23, strike “such sums as are necessary” and insert “$11,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2025”.

SA 905. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. Hoeven) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 212, to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities; as follows:

On page 12, line 16, insert “the extent to which the programs and services overlap or are duplicative,” after “development,”.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator JACKY ROSEN, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Troy D. Edgar, of California, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, dated June 27, 2019.


AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Minority and Majority 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 27, 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 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Peter Josephhipp, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Charles R. Eskridge III, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, William Shaw Stickman IV, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Jennifer Philpott Wilson, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and Wilmer Ocasio, to be United States Marshal for the District of Puerto Rico, Department of Justice.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following nominations: Peter Josephhipp, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Charles R. Eskridge III, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, William Shaw Stickman IV, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Jennifer Philpott Wilson, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and Wilmer Ocasio, to be United States Marshal for the District of Puerto Rico, Department of Justice.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my defense follow, Joshua Culver, be granted floor privileges for the length of the current debate on the NDAA.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jake Vance and James Schmidt, legislative correspondents in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to conduct a hearing on the consideration of Calendar Nos. 300 through 325 and all nominations on the Secretary’s desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be entered in the Record; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed, are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12303:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (ih) Gene F. Price

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12303:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (ih) Shawn E. Duane

Rear Adm. (ih) Scott D. Jones

Rear Adm. (ih) John B. Mustin

Rear Adm. (ih) John A. Eilerts

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12303:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (ih) Alan J. Reyes

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12303:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (ih) Troy M. McClelland

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Charles A. Flynn

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12303:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Cap. Mark E. Moritz

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12303:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Cap. Michael T. Curran

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12303:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Cap. Leslie E. Reardon, III

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12303:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Kenneth R. Blackmon

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12303:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Robert C. Nowakowski
The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Col. William Green, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Eric P. Wenst

To be general

Col. Arthur P. Wunder

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

Capt. Philip W. Yu

Capt. Pamela C. Miller

Capt. Paula D. Dunn

Capt. Michael J. Steffen

Capt. Scott K. Fuller

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army Reserve to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Paul J. LaCamera

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army Reserve to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Michael E. Kurilla

To be general

Rear Adm. Ricky L. Williamson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Capt. Phillip W. Yu

FIRE FORCE

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Arthur P. Wunder

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army as a Chaplain under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624 and 706:

To be brigadier general

Col. William Green, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Philip G. Sawyer

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Eric P. Wenst

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be a major general


The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Brig. Gen. Joseph L. Biehler

Brig. Gen. William B. Blaylock, II

Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Bouchard

Brig. Gen. Paul B. Chauncey, III

Brig. Gen. Mark A. Jackson

Brig. Gen. William J. Edwards

Brig. Gen. Lee M. Ellis

Brig. Gen. Pablo Estrada, Jr.

Brig. Gen. Lapthe C. Flor

Brig. Gen. Troy D. Galloway

Brig. Gen. Lee W. Hopkins

Brig. Gen. Marvin T. Hunt

Brig. Gen. Mark C. Jackson

Brig. Gen. Richard F. Johnson

Brig. Gen. Tim C. Lawson

Brig. Gen. Kevin D. Lyons

Brig. Gen. Michael A. Mitchell

Brig. Gen. Michel A. Natali

Brig. Gen. Chad J. Parker

Brig. Gen. Gregory A. Porter

Brig. Gen. Jeffrey D. Smiley

Brig. Gen. David N. Vesper

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be vice admiral

Capt. Huan T. Nguyen

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY’S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN426 AIR FORCE nominations (43) beginning THOMAS JOSEPH ALFORD, and ending GABRIEL MATTHEW YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN651 AIR FORCE nominations (16) beginning ELBERT R. ALFORD, IV, and ending TRACIE L. SINGLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN731 AIR FORCE nomination of Catheline M. Tolvo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN732 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning CHRISTIAN P. COOPER, and ending RYAN E. SNYDER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN733 AIR FORCE nominations (9) beginning KEITH A. BERRY, and ending STEVEN P. ROGERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN803 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning HASSAN N. BATAYNEH, and ending ASAD U. QAMAR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN842 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning JASON A. KONINSEN, and ending ROBIN T. BINGHAM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2019.

IN THE ARMY

PN431 ARMY nominations (15) beginning JASON BULLOCK, and ending DEMETRIES WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN432 ARMY nominations (75) beginning JULIE A. AKE, and ending D013716, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN534 ARMY nomination of Shane R. Reeves, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 26, 2019.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN535 ARMY nominations (19) beginning ALAN THOMAS, and ending STANTON D. TROTTER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN563 ARMY nominations (167) beginning JASON B. ALISANGCO, and ending D014026, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN571 ARMY nominations (28) beginning MICHAEL M. ARMSTRONG, and ending MAO X. ZHOU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN573 ARMY nominations (3) beginning GEORDON N. JUMAN, and ending RUSSELL T. MCEARNE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN738 ARMY nomination of Carmen Y. Salcedo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN737 ARMY nominations (2) beginning RUSSELL F. DUBOSE, and ending TIMOTHY D. FORREST, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN801 ARMY nominations (33) beginning MICHAEL J. BALLARD, and ending D015102, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN805 ARMY nomination of Andre L. Thomas, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN806 ARMY nomination of D013839, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN807 ARMY nomination of Christopher B. Nettles, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN808 ARMY nominations (93) beginning EDWARD C. ADAMS, and ending G010558, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN809 ARMY nominations (49) beginning CHARLES M. ABEYAWARDENA, and ending G010449, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN810 ARMY nominations (386) beginning JOHN R. ABELLA, and ending D014610, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN325 MARINE CORPS nominations of Shawn E. McGowan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN324 MARINE CORPS nomination of Michael R. Lukkes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN323 MARINE CORPS nomination of James Y. Malone, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN676 NAVY nominations (12) beginning MATTHEW P. BEARE, and ending KEITH A. TUKES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN677 NAVY nominations (27) beginning RICHARD L. BOSWORTH, and ending MATTHEW C. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN678 NAVY nominations (13) beginning LANCE C. ASKEW, and ending DONALD V. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN679 NAVY nominations (10) beginning MARK A. ANGELO, and ending GREGORY E. SUTTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN680 NAVY nominations (17) beginning REX A. BOONYOBIAS, and ending SARAH E. ZARRO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN681 NAVY nominations (3) beginning SCOTT DRAYTON, and ending THOMAS R. WAGENER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN682 NAVY nominations (11) beginning KEITH ARCHIBALD, and ending DAVID C. WEBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN683 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ERIN E. O. ACOSTA, and ending CHRISTI S. MONTE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN684 NAVY nominations (15) beginning ADRIAN Z. BEJAR, and ending ROBERT A. WOODRUFF, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN685 NAVY nominations (5) beginning JAMES M. BELMONT, and ending JON M. HERSEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN686 NAVY nominations (10) beginning ERIN D. MARLER, and ending SHERRY W. WANGWHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN687 NAVY nominations (4) beginning WILLIAM H. CLINTON, and ending SARAH T. SELFKLYER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN688 NAVY nominations (6) beginning KEVIN A. SCHNITZER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN738 NAVY nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL R. BRUNEAU, and ending HANS L. HERRMANS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN739 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MICHAEL H. LINGA, and ending ALLAN J. SANDOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN740 NAVY nominations (14) beginning ERIN G. ADAMS, and ending IAN L. VALERIO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN741 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MICHAELE HALL, and ending DARREN L. STEINBERG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN742 NAVY nominations (24) beginning LILLIAN CHARLES, and ending M. TELLIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN743 NAVY nominations (16) beginning VIRGINIA S. BLACKMAN, and ending ABI-GAIL M. YABLONSKY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN744 NAVY nominations (11) beginning BRIAN J. ELLIS, JR., and ending SYLVAIN E. LAMBERT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN745 NAVY nominations (30) beginning ZIAD T. ABOONA, and ending LISA A. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN746 NAVY nominations (75) beginning RUBEN D. ACOSTA, and ending LUKE A. ZABROCKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN747 NAVY nominations (18) beginning DAVID L. BELL, JR., and ending HAROLD S. ZALD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN748 NAVY nominations (8) beginning WILLIAM R. BUTLER, and ending OMAAR E. TOBIAS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN749 NAVY nominations (5) beginning BRIAN J. HALL, and ending PHILLIP E. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN750 NAVY nominations (3) beginning ESTHER A. BOPP, and ending ROBERTA S. TAYLOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN751 NAVY nominations (3) beginning FREDERICK L. LEACHMAN, and ending LIKE V. K. LEE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN752 NAVY nominations (15) beginning JEREMIAH C. CORR, and ending JOSEPH M. ZACK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN753 NAVY nominations (94) beginning FREDERICK G. ALEGRE, and ending KENNETH R. WOOSTER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN754 NAVY nominations (4) beginning MICHAEL P. CASTELLANOS, and ending KEVIN A. SCHNITZER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN755 NAVY nominations (2) beginning CHARLOTTE A. BROWNING, and ending RACHEL H. WADEBROWN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN756 NAVY nominations (16) beginning JULIE M. BARR, and ending JACOB S. WIEMANN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN757 NAVY nominations (8) beginning LIAM M. APOSTOL, and ending ANN M. VALIOTIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN758 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ANTHONY L. LACOURSE, and ending SHANNON C. ZAHUMENSKY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN759 NAVY nominations (2) beginning SCOTT A. HIGGINS, and ending FEIHUA KU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN760 NAVY nominations (17) beginning NATHANIEL A. BAILEY, and ending LEONARD W. WALKER, IV, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN761 NAVY nominations (8) beginning DAVID K. BOYLAN, and ending NED L. SWANSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN762 NAVY nominations (2) beginning ONOPRIO F. MARCONI, and ending KURT D. WEKASH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN763 NAVY nominations (4) beginning DAVID L. BACHELOR, and ending THOMAS J. TAYLOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN764 NAVY nominations (3) beginning ANDREW M. COOK, and ending DENIZ M. PISKIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN765 NAVY nomination of Christina M. Allee, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN766 NAVY nomination of David A. Scully, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN767 NAVY nomination of Jon B. Voss, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN811 NAVY nomination of Meager D. Chappell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN812 NAVY nomination of Ryan D. Scully, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN813 NAVY nomination of Brandon T. Bridges, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN814 NAVY nomination of Mark S. Johnson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN815 NAVY nomination of Chandler W. Johnson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN816 NAVY nomination of Justin R. Taylor, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN817 NAVY nomination of Kristine N. Bench, and ending DAVID A. ROBERTS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN818 NAVY nominations (25) beginning DIEGO F. ALVARADO, and ending JARED D. BREDGES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.
M. WILHELM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN947 NAVY nomination of MARTIN E. ROBERTS, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2019.

PN948 NAVY nominations (3) beginning TODD E. SMOLA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2019.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 199.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Wallace nominations en bloc?

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Wallace nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 113.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Veronica Daigle, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Daigle nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 342.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Wallace, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Wallace nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 329.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 330.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 331.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 332.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 333.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 334.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 335.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 336.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 337.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 338.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 339.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 340.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 341.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 342.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 343.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 344.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 345.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 346.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 347.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 348.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 349.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 350.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advance and consent to the Nomination?

The nominations were confirmed.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?
Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Ronald Douglas Johnson, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of El Salvador; and David Michael Satterfield, of Missouri, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Turkey.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Jorgan nominations?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 121.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

We, the undersigned Senators, in accord with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nominations of Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations of Aditya Bamzai, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2020; Travis LeBlanc, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2025. (Reappointment)

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 47.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 343.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nominations of Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.


EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of T. Kent Wetherell II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida.
CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of T. Kent Wetherell II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida.


The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 52.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The legislative clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of J. Nicholas Ranjan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.


LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 103.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.


LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The legislative clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Mr. McCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.


LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency.

CLOTURE MOTION
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency.


LEGISLATIVE SESSION
Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority reported vote in the Committee of Energy and Natural Resources.

Rob's nomination passed the Environment and Public Works Committee by unanimous vote, and a near-unanimous reported vote in the Committee of Energy and Natural Resources.

Rob Wallace is an outstanding choice for this position of Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks. He is the right person for the job, and I am so pleased the Senate has now confirmed his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

SIGNING AUTHORITY
Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, the senior Senator from South Carolina, take the chair from the junior Senator from North Carolina be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions from June 27 through the July 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

CONFIRMATION OF ROB WALLACE
Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would just last a few words about Rob Wallace, the newly confirmed Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife, and Parks at the Department of Interior.

I have known Rob for over 35 years. Without question, Rob is the right person for the job. Throughout his long and distinguished career, Rob has struck the proper balance between wildlife management, habitat management, and the use of our public lands.

In terms of wildlife conservation, Rob Boardman has been a leader in terms of his commitment. Rob’s experience and leadership in Wyoming and in our Nation’s capital are ideally suited for this critically important position.

Throughout his 45-year career, Rob has served in a variety of jobs that directly relate to the two Federal agencies he has been nominated to oversee. Rob began his career as a seasonal park ranger in Grand Teton National Park. Since then, Rob has served in a number of positions. He has been Assistant Director of the National Park Service, chief of staff for Wyoming Senator Malcolm Wallop, staff director for the U.S. Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee—a committee on which I currently sit. He has been chief of staff for Wyoming Governor Jim Geringer, and manager of U.S. Government Relations for the General Electric Company.

Rob currently serves as the president of the Upper Green River Conservancy. It is the nation’s first cooperative conservation bank. Rob cofounded the Upper Green River Conservancy. It protects core sage grouse habitat in the ecologically rich and the energy rich Upper Green River watershed in Southwest Wyoming.

He built an innovative partnership of ranchers, conservation groups, energy companies, investors, and other stakeholders. Rob is also the founding member of the board of the Grand Teton National Park Foundation, a group of people absolutely working together, committed to the Grand Teton National Park. It promotes the park’s cultural, historic, and natural resources.

He has also served on the boards of many organizations dedicated to conserving wildlife and enhancing our national parks.

Rob’s nomination passed the Environment and Public Works Committee by unanimous vote, and a near-unanimous reported vote in the Committee of Energy and Natural Resources.

Rob Wallace is an outstanding choice for this position of Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks. He is the right person for the job, and I am so pleased the Senate has now confirmed his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

IRAN
Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I am going to try to do this in about 12 minutes, since I am not sure how many people are left to speak tonight and I know the staff worked hard and we will be up early tomorrow voting on the pending Udall amendment. That is what I want to talk about.

I have watched all week the debate on some of these topics. I think it is a really good debate, actually. In some ways, I am very pleased the amendment has been offered because it has given us an opportunity to talk about a topic I don’t think we have talked enough Green, that is foreign policy, the security threats before our country, and, in particular, what the role of Congress is in all of this.

There are a couple of things I want to say at the outset. Here is the first. A lot of people who cover this stuff in the news like very simplistic terms. It makes it easier to write the articles and makes it easier to describe the circumstances. The terms people like to use are “hawk,” or “dove,” or “war-like.” I am not in favor of war. I have actually never advocated for a military attack on Iran, in these circumstances especially. There are a lot of reasons for it, but it will take me more than 15 minutes to explain it to you. Suffice it to say, it is certainly not the first or the second.

The policy of the United States in Iran today is the one I support; that is, crippling economic sanctions that deny them the money to do the bad things they do but also a forced posture that we are prepared with enough people there in the military, so if they do attack us, we can defend ourselves.

I want to say at the outset that I am not here today to call for war or to call for war but to speak about reality and the situation as we face it today.

The second thing I want to point to is there is this notion out there that there are some constitutional limitation on the President when it comes to the use of force in virtually every circumstance and that somehow the current President is being enabled by the Members of his party here to do things without the power of Congress, that is not true. I will explain why in a moment. I want to begin with why we are even here. It is one of the topics that has been touched on this week, which I think deserves a direct response. I heard a number of Senators who came to the floor. I watched the debate last night, and there will be another one tonight within the Democratic Party. You almost get a sense that what they are arguing is that Iran was under sanctions, Iran wasn’t doing anything, until Donald Trump came along and pulled us out of the Iran deal. That is just not true. That is patently false.

The only thing Iran wasn’t doing is enriching uranium beyond a certain threshold. That is not necessarily a bad thing that they weren’t doing it, but that is the only thing that deal covered.

Here is what Iran was still doing. Iran was still sponsors terrorism. You can ask why is that. It is just terrorism? Iran wants to be the dominant power in the Middle East, and one of the ways they seek to achieve it is to find all of these groups—Hezbollah, Shia militias in Iraq and Syria, the Houthis in Yemen—and empower those groups.

They have an organization called the IRGC, which is the real military and the real power in Iran. Underneath the IRGC, there is an organization called the Quds Force, which is their covert operations unit led by a guy named General Soleimani. He goes around the entire region sponsoring these groups—training them and providing weapons.

They have an organization called the IRGC, which is the real military and the real power in Iran. Underneath the IRGC, there is an organization called the Quds Force, which is their covert operations unit led by a guy named General Soleimani. He goes around the entire region sponsoring these groups—training them and providing weapons.

They have an organization called the IRGC, which is the real military and the real power in Iran. Underneath the IRGC, there is an organization called the Quds Force, which is their covert operations unit led by a guy named General Soleimani. He goes around the entire region sponsoring these groups—training them and providing weapons.

They have an organization called the IRGC, which is the real military and the real power in Iran. Underneath the IRGC, there is an organization called the Quds Force, which is their covert operations unit led by a guy named General Soleimani. He goes around the entire region sponsoring these groups—training them and providing weapons.
Here is what they hope to do. If they ever get into a conflict, they will use these groups to attack people. Why do they use those groups? No. 1, because Iran doesn’t have the ability to station troops all over the region. No. 2, it gives some level of deniability. They can say: We didn’t attack you. It was the Houthis or Shia militia. It allows them some level of deniability while still inflicting pain.

If you want to know what else Iran has done using that strategy, it has maimed or killed hundreds of American service men and women in Iraq. They didn’t buy all those IEDs that were blowing up on Amazon; they didn’t order them on eBay. They were built and supplied by the Iranians. That is who did it. There is no dispute about that.

President Obama signed this Iran deal. Iran began to get more money into their economy or their education system. Let me tell you what they didn’t do. They didn’t build schools, roads, and bridges. They didn’t reinvest in their economy in education systems. Iran took the money they were making from the Iran deal. The Iran deal now allows them to engage in commerce that they weren’t allowed to. They took that extra money, and they used it to sponsor terrorism—to sponsor Hezbollah in Lebanon.

Today Hezbollah not only has more missiles than they had 10 or 15 years ago, but their missiles are better than they’re ever built. They could now, theoretically, overwhelm Israel’s defenses with barrages of attacks. They have guidance systems on those missiles now. In fact, they have gotten so much assistance from Iran, they don’t even need to even try. They can make them by themselves.

What about the Houthis? The Houthis are a group that already existed, but they were only able to make the gains they made in Yemen with Iran’s help. If you read in the news everyday about these missiles and drones used by the Houthis to attack Saudi Arabia. It doesn’t get a lot of coverage, but where do you think they bought these things from? Do you think they made them? We didn’t sell them to them. Those are Iranian missiles. All of it is provided by this additional money they got their hands on. They also conduct cyber attacks.

 Hezbollah—in fact, but 3 or 4 weeks ago, they were blowing up on Amazon; they didn’t order them on those ships. If you say that, you have to pull out of the deal. That is why they wouldn’t acknowledge it.

We have them on video. I heard people ask how we know those were Iranian. This is ridiculous. The way, the mines look identical to the ones Iran makes. So they did that. That was their plan, OK? Their plan was to attack us using other forces, but to have some level of deniability. “It wasn’t us.”

They also know that there are divisions in American politics and that the President is unpopular in many countries. A lot of people around the world and in the United States would love nothing more than to say “Yes, how do we know it was Iran?” for different reasons. That is what they were banking on, but then they shut down an unmanned U.S. vehicle, and they admitted it because that would have been difficult to cover. That is what really kicked off a lot of this argument that we are now hearing.

I want everybody to remember, if you go back 3 or 4 weeks, that there were people in the building and people on television—I saw them—commentators and others—who were basically implying that this was all not true, that there was no threat emanating from Iran, that it wasn’t doing anything unusual. Now they are admitting that Iran is doing something unusual and dangerous. They are trying to connect that to Iran, but they were basically implying that this was all being made up by people who wanted a war.

Think that through logically. That means there would be dozens and dozens of career service men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces and in the Pentagon who would be, basically, lying to us about this. That is absurd.

So we get to the point of how this really got us here. It wasn’t the deal with Iran or the pulling out of the deal that caused this. This has always been. This is what Iran has always done, and it has been doing it for two decades.
now and longer. To somehow act as if Iran is more belligerent today than it was 6 months ago or 6 years ago is just not true. It is just that the threats have become more imminent directly against us.

When you look at this amendment, the amendment is basically designed to say that the President cannot enter into a war unless Congress approves it, which is an interesting dynamic.

No. 1, when you hear people saying you have a right from Congress, what they are talking about is the War Powers Resolution. In the aftermath of Vietnam and that era, Congress said, from now on, we are not getting into any more of these undeclared wars. If a President is going to commit service men and women for an extended period of time, it has to come through Congress.

No President—no administration—has ever accepted that resolution as being in the Constitution. From that point on, every President—Democrat and Republican—has taken the position that this is an unconstitutional infringement on the power of the Commander in Chief. That has been the official position of every administration, Republican and Democrat, since that passed.

Nonetheless, on various occasions, Presidents have come to Congress for authority, which I think is a smart thing to do, especially for an extended engagement, because we are stronger and our policies are more effective when Congress and the American people are behind you. That is why President George W. Bush sought the authorization for Afghanistan and why he sought it for Iraq. It was the right thing to do, and it made sense. Yet no President has ever admitted that it is constitutional, and I share that view.

For a moment, let’s assume that it were. Well, that resolution lays out three tests that happen: One, a President, a Commander in Chief, can commit U.S. forces to a hostility, to a war, to a fight.

The first thing is that there has to be a declaration of war. That is in the Constitution too. Congress can declare war.

The second is that Congress can authorize the use of force. That is when you hear all of this talk about the authorization for use of military force, the AUMF. That is what we had in Afghanistan, and that is what we had in Iraq. That is what a lot of people around here think we need if we are going to do something with Iraq.

There is a third component they like to ignore, and the third component is that a President can institute U.S. military action if Congress declares war, if Congress authorizes the use of force, or, No. 3, if there is an emergency that causes us to respond to an attack against the United States, our territories, our holdings, or our Armed Forces.

I want to tell you that if a Shia militia attacks a U.S. base in Iraq, this is a pretty clear attack on the Armed Forces. If it shoots down one of our unmanned, unarmed platforms over international airspace, that is an attack on our Armed Forces. If they try to kidnap or murder an ambassador or a diplomat by taking it hostage, that is an attack on our U.S. territory since embassies are sovereign territories.

If you look at what the administration has done, the only thing the administration has done when it has an attack on us is to say that we have made changes to military posture in the region so, if we are attacked, we can respond. That is the only thing it has done.

I don’t know if you read the plain text of the language that they are wrapping themselves around—those who criticize what the administration has done—and not realize that it is fully authorized. If we are attacked, the President is authorized to respond, he has a right to respond—he has an obligation.

Think of the reverse. If the Iranians were to attack a facility in Iraq and murder 100 Americans who would be working as diplomats or if they were to kill 200 soldiers, the first questions that every one of the President’s critics would be asking on TV would be: Why didn’t we have enough forces in the region to protect them? Why didn’t we have a plan to save them? There would be congressional hearings, and there would be Members of Congress who would scream at the administration: Why didn’t you have people there to save them?

In anticipating that this could happen, our military leaders, in their looking at the threats and understanding the environment, asked the administration to send additional forces so they may be in a position of having enough people and assets to respond in case of an attack.

I will go further than that. Imagine this. It is given verifiable information that an attack is imminent by Iran or one of its proxies and that the only way to save American lives is to wipe out the place from which it is going to launch the attack. Even if you acted first, that is self-defense. You are getting ahead of preventing an attack, not to mention the fact that the best way to respond to an attack is to prevent it from happening in the first place, and having a force posture in the region is one of the best ways to do that. That is the only thing that has been done here.

This amendment is just not necessary because, in assuming they are arguing that the War Powers Resolution does not apply to Iran, Congress’s power and role are in all of this, in the very text of that resolution, it makes clear that a President has a right to introduce military forces and to use military force to defend Americans, to defend America, and to defend our Armed Forces.

So why do we need language that says that a second time? Some would say: Well, it is redundant, and it is already the law. Why not just vote for it again?

That is the final and, perhaps, the most important point in all of this—that the timing couldn’t really be delayed. It was not necessary, but the redundancy here is actually damaging, and here is why.

I think sometimes we make a terrible mistake in American politics. We ascribe our attributes to those of the enemy. We ascribe our attributes to those of the leader of other countries. We hear that the President of Iran said something, we think Iran’s President and his system is like ours. They are not. The President of Iran doesn’t have one-tenth the power of our President, meaning there is a Supreme Leader, and everything goes to the Supreme Leader, a cleric. That is where the power really resides.

No. 2, we make a terrible mistake of believing that they truly understand us, our systems, and our debates when we don’t. We are living in a network world and here is why.

There is a pretty clear attack on the Armed Forces. If it shoots down one of our unmanned, unarmed platforms over international airspace, that is an attack on our Armed Forces. If they try to kidnap or murder an ambassador or a diplomat by taking it hostage, that is an attack on our U.S. territory since embassies are sovereign territories.

When you look at this amendment, for example, is never going to become law.

Here is what they do believe, and I encourage all Members here to go out and inform themselves as to this. As a Senator, one has the opportunity to do this. You do believe that the President cannot respond. They believe that this President cannot and would not respond. They believe that there is a threshold—that there are x numbers of Americans they can kill and that there are certain types of attacks they can get away with without getting a response back. That is what they believe.

Why do they believe it?

No. 1, it is that our President has talked on various occasions about whether they are all at the same level. They are certain types of attacks they can get away with without getting a response back. That is what they believe.

When you look at the constitutional infringement on the question of constitutional infringement, they see it as a pretty clear attack on the Armed Forces. If they try to kidnap or murder an ambassador or a diplomat by taking it hostage, that is an attack on our U.S. territory since embassies are sovereign territories.

If you look at what the administration has done, the only thing the administration has done when it has an attack on us is to say that we have made changes to military posture in the region so, if we are attacked, we can respond. That is the only thing it has done.

I don’t know how you read the plain text of the language that they are wrapping themselves around—those who criticize what the administration has done—and not realize that it is fully authorized. If we are attacked, the President is authorized to respond, he has a right to respond—he has an obligation.

Think of the reverse. If the Iranians were to attack a facility in Iraq and murder 100 Americans who would be working as diplomats or if they were to kill 200 soldiers, the first questions that every one of the President’s critics would be asking on TV would be: Why didn’t we have enough forces in the region to protect them? Why didn’t we have a plan to save them? There would be congressional hearings, and there would be Members of Congress who would scream at the administration: Why didn’t you have people there to save them?

In anticipating that this could happen, our military leaders, in their looking at the threats and understanding the environment, asked the administration to send additional forces so they may be in a position of having enough people and assets to respond in case of an attack.

I will go further than that. Imagine this. It is given verifiable information that an attack is imminent by Iran or one of its proxies and that the only way to save American lives is to wipe out the place from which it is going to launch the attack. Even if you acted first, that is self-defense. You are getting ahead of preventing an attack, not to mention the fact that the best way to respond to an attack is to prevent it from happening in the first place, and having a force posture in the region is one of the best ways to do that. That is the only thing that has been done here.

This amendment is just not necessary because, in assuming they are arguing that the War Powers Resolution does not apply to Iran, Congress’s power and role are in all of this, in the very text of that resolution, it makes clear that a President has a right to introduce military forces and to use military force to defend Americans, to defend America, and to defend our Armed Forces.

So why do we need language that says that a second time? Some would say: Well, it is redundant, and it is already the law. Why not just vote for it again?

That is the final and, perhaps, the most important point in all of this—that the timing couldn’t really be delayed. It was not necessary, but the redundancy here is actually damaging, and here is why.

I think sometimes we make a terrible mistake in American politics. We ascribe our attributes to those of the enemy. We ascribe our attributes to those of the leader of other countries. We hear that the President of Iran said something, we think Iran’s President and his system is like ours. They are not. The President of Iran doesn’t have one-tenth the power of our President, meaning there is a Supreme Leader, and everything goes to the Supreme Leader, a cleric. That is where the power really resides.

No. 2, we make a terrible mistake of believing that they truly understand us, our systems, and our debates when we don’t. We are living in a network world and here is why.

There is a pretty clear attack on the Armed Forces. If it shoots down one of our unmanned, unarmed platforms over international airspace, that is an attack on our Armed Forces. If they try to kidnap or murder an ambassador or a diplomat by taking it hostage, that is an attack on our U.S. territory since embassies are sovereign territories.

When you look at this amendment, for example, is never going to become law.

Here is what they do believe, and I encourage all Members here to go out and inform themselves as to this. As a Senator, one has the opportunity to do this. You do believe that the President cannot respond. They believe that this President cannot and would not respond. They believe that there is a threshold—that there are x numbers of Americans they can kill and that there are certain types of attacks they can get away with without getting a response back. That is what they believe.

Why do they believe it?

No. 1, it is that our President has talked on various occasions about whether they are all at the same level. They are certain types of attacks they can get away with without getting a response back. That is what they believe.

When you look at the constitutional infringement, they see it as a pretty clear attack on the Armed Forces. If they try to kidnap or murder an ambassador or a diplomat by taking it hostage, that is an attack on our U.S. territory since embassies are sovereign territories.
how it would be reported. In fact, if there were a close vote on it, as I anticipate there will be, the way it would be reported would be as “even a handful of Republicans and virtually every Democrat voted to send the President a message that we ‘don’t want you using our Armed Forces in wars against Iran.’” That is how it would be reported. That is how they would read it. It would only reinforce this belief among some in that regime that they can go further than they actually can.

I do mean to say this to argue that there are Members of this body here who are deliberately putting the men and women of our Armed Forces in danger. I am telling them I don’t know if they have thought through that part of it. What we do here and how it is perceived in other parts of the world, especially in a reclusive organization such as the regime in Iran, are often two very different things.

The danger with this amendment is that it would confirm to several hard-liners in that regime that the President is constrained, that America’s President will not be able to respond, and that they will be able to get away with more than they actually will get away with.

In some ways, ironically, I believe that even a big vote on this—but, certainly, the passage of it—increases the chance of war. I say that because, if they miscalculate and they read into this their opportunity to attack at a higher level without taking a retaliatory response, they are going to do it. Then they are going to be wrong, and then the retaliation will come. Then it is on. Then we can’t predict what will happen next.

What happens next is terrifying to even contemplate because what happens next could be a Hezbollah strike against Israel and Israel’s responding 10 times stronger. It could be Hezbollah to abduct, kill, murder American diplomats or personnel inside of Lebanon; it could be Shia militias throughout Iraq and Syria attacking U.S. personnel; it could be increased Houthi attacks not just into Saudi Arabia but potentially even hitting civilian populations and Saudi Arabia’s responding back. What could come next is a spiraling series of events that could lead to a dangerous regional war. That is not an exaggeration. There is an opportunity to believe that a miscalculation on the part of Iran and what it can get away with would trigger that.

This is an unnecessary amendment because, if you accept the War Powers Resolution as valid under our Constitution—I do not—it already reads that the President has a right to respond in self-defense. The administration has made it very clear that this is the only way it intends to use it. It has made it abundantly clear. In fact, there is no posture to use it. If you look at what we have in the region—the number of ships and the number of people—we are not postured for an invasion or an all-out war. We are postured for defensive operations and retaliatory strikes to an attack, and that is what the administration says it intends to do.

What it intends to do is to continue forward, strangling the sources of financing that the Iranian regime is using to sponsor terrorism and its ballistic missile program and having enough force in the region to protect our men and women who serve us if they were to come under attack. The President is allowed to do that in the Constitution and in the War Powers Resolution.

All this amendment does is create a dangerous opportunity to be misunderstood and lead to something, and that will trigger a response. Then we will have a war. For those who are considering still voting for this because they want to reassert Congress’s role, this is the wrong time and place in which to do it.

I will close with this. I don’t agree with all of the President’s foreign policy views. I can tell you, for example, that I do believe that openly talking about getting out of the Middle East as soon as possible is one of this thinking that America is constrained and that we really don’t have the dedication or the commitment to see this through if we are attacked. Yet, in fairness, this President is far less likely to go into a war or to start one than was his predecessor—or his two predecessors, actually. He showed great restraint the other day. It strikes me that not only is this unnecessary from a policy perspective, it is also unnecessary from a personality perspective. This is not a President who is looking to start wars. This is a President who is looking to get out of the ones we are already in. Again, I just don’t know why we would run the risk of putting something out there that could be misinterpreted and lead to an attack when we have a President who has no intention of starting a war, when we have a military posture in the region that would not support an offensive military operation or anything to which to go to Pakistan or Iran or Iraq we like, and when we have this danger of miscalculation.

The amendment has been filed, and there will be a vote on it tomorrow. I just hope that the handful of people still thinking about it will consider all of these points.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2940) to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through September 30, 2019

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2940.

The PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2940) to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through September 30, 2019

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2940.

The PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. McConnell. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDENT. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 2940) was passed.

Mr. McConnell. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Extending the Program of Block Grants to States for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and Related Programs, Through September 30, 2019

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2047, submitted today.

The PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2047) to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McConnell. I further ask that the bill be read a second time and passed and the motion 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 bill (S. 2047) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2047

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 223(d)(3) of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 1396w–1 note) is amended by striking “June 30, 2019” and inserting “July 14, 2019”.

SEC. 2. MEDICAID IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1911(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w–1(b)(1)) is amended by striking “$6,000,000” and inserting “$11,000,000”.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STONEWALL UPRISING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 270, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 270) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall uprising.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 270) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 270) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 resolution (S. Res. 271) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

COLUMBIA RIVER IN-LIEU AND TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 38, S. 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 50) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Indian Affairs—

(a) to assess conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes;

(b) to improve access to electricity, sewer, and water infrastructure, where feasible, to reflect needs for sanitary and safe use of facilities referred to in section (a); and

(c) for improvements to existing structures and infrastructure to improve sanitation and safety conditions assessed under subsection (a).

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Hoenen amendment at the desk be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 904) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the authorization amount)

On page 3, line 23, strike “such sums as are necessary” and insert “$11,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2025”.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 50), as amended, was passed as follows:

S. 50

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Columbia River In-Lieu and Treaty Fishing Access Sites Improvement Act”.

SEC. 2. SANITATION AND SAFETY CONDITIONS AT CERTAIN BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS FACILITIES.

(a) ASSESSMENT OF CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in consultation with affected Columbia River Treaty tribes, may assess current sanitation and safety conditions on lands held by the United States for the benefit of the affected Columbia River Treaty tribes (as defined in section 2(c)) have improved as a result of the activities authorized in section 2;

(b) EXCLUSIVE AUTHORIZATION; CONTRACTS.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Indian Affairs—

(1) may enter into contracts with an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.); or

(2) to include other Federal agencies that have relevant expertise.

(c) DEFINITION OF AFFECTED COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY TRIBES.—In this section, the term “affected Columbia River Treaty tribes” means the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and the Confederated Tribes of the Yakama Nation.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $11,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2025, to remain available until expended—

(1) for improvements to existing structures and infrastructure to improve sanitation and safety conditions assessed under subsection (a); and

(2) to improve access to electricity, sewer, and water infrastructure, where feasible, to reflect needs for sanitary and safe use of facilities referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 3. STUDY OF ASSESSMENT AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES.

The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, shall conduct a study to evaluate whether the sanitation and safety conditions on lands held by the United States for the benefit of the affected Columbia River Treaty tribes (as defined in section 2(c)) have improved as a result of the activities authorized in section 2; and

(2) prepare and submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of that study.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

INDIAN COMMUNITY ECONOMIC ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 63, S. 212.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 212) to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs on those lands, that were set aside to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds—

(1) in accordance with the Act of March 2, 1946 (59 Stat. 10, chapter 9) (commonly known as the “River and Harbor Act of 1945”); or

(2) in accordance with title IV of Public Law 100–581 (102 Stat. 2944).

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 38, S. 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 212) to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs...
Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Hoeven amendment at the desk be agreed to and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 905) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the Indian Economic Development Feasibility Study)

On page 12, line 16, insert “the extent to which the programs and services overlap or are duplicative,” after “development.”

The bill (S. 212), as amended, was passed as follows:

S. 212

The amendment (No. 905) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the Indian Economic Development Feasibility Study)

On page 12, line 16, insert “the extent to which the programs and services overlap or are duplicative,” after “development.”

The bill (S. 212), as amended, was passed as follows:

S. 212

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Indian Community Economic Enhancement Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) to bring industry and economic development to Indian communities, Indian Tribes must overcome a number of barriers, including—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) may not be available; or

(ii) may come at a higher cost than such access costs to non-Indian communities;

(B) Federal capital improvement programs, such as those that facilitate tax-exempt bond financing and loan guarantees, are tools that help improve or replace crumbling infrastructure;

(C) lack of parity in treatment of an Indian Tribe as a governmental unit (and as a result, the Federal tax and certain other regulatory laws impede, in the ability of Indian Tribes to raise capital through issuance of tax exempt debt, equity, debt instruments, and benefit from other investment incentives accorded to State and local governmental entities; and

(D) as a result of the disparity in treatment of Indian Tribes described in subparagraph (B), investors may avoid financing, or demand a premium to finance projects in Indian communities, making the projects more costly or inaccessible;

(2) there are a number of Federal loan guarantee programs available to facilitate financing of business, energy, economic, housing, and community development projects in Indian communities, and those programs may support public-private partnerships for infrastructure development, but improvements and support are needed for those programs specific to Indian communities to facilitate more effectively private financing for infrastructure and other urgent development needs; and

(3) most real property held by Indian Tribes is trust or restricted land that essential cannot be sold; and

(B) while creative solutions, such as lease-hold mortgages, have been developed in response to the problem identified in subparagraph (A), some solutions remain subject to review and approval by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, adding additional costs and delay to Tribal projects.


(a) FINDINGS; PURPOSES.—Section 2 of the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4301) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) APPLICABILITY TO INDIAN-OWNED BUSINESSES.—The findings and purposes in subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to any Indian-owned business governed—

1. by Tribal laws regulating trade or commerce on Indian lands; or


(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4302) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (6) and paragraphs (7) through (9), as paragraphs (2) through (7) and paragraphs (8) through (10), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) the following:

“(B) to consult with Indian Tribes and with Indian entrepreneurs who are not natural persons; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) the following:

“OFFICE.—The term ‘Office’ means the Office of Native American Business Development established by section 4(a)(1).”;

and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (7) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) the following:

“DUTIES OF DIRECTOR.—The Director shall—

1. to identify regulatory, legal, or other barriers to increasing Tribal access to Federal policy and programs that facilitate industry and economic development, including qualifying or approving collateral structures,
measurements of economic strength, and contributions of Indian economies in Indian communities through the Authority established under section 4 of the Indian Tribal Reform and Business Development Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4301 note);

“(4) to ensure consultation with Indian Tribes regarding increasing investment in Indian communities and the development of the report required in paragraph (5); and

“(5) not less than once every 2 years, to provide a report to Congress regarding—

(A) the extent to which the programs and services identified, the study shall assess and quantify the extent of the assistance provided to Indian communities resulting from such initiatives and recommendations for promoting sustained growth of the Tribal economies;

(B) the extent to which the programs and services overlap related to economic development, the extent to which Indian Tribes, businesses, and communities of the programs, the capital needs of Indian Tribes, individuals, businesses, and communities served, and the findings of the study and recommendations shall be made to provide awards to Indian economic enterprises with the purpose of increasing or decreasing the dollar value and efforts made by additional agencies to to aggregate data regarding compliance with this section.

(C) the identified regulatory, legal, and other barriers referenced in paragraph (3).

(b) WAIVER.—For assistance provided pursuant to section 108 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4707) to benefit Native Community Development Financial Institutions, as defined by the Secretary of the Treasury, section 108(e) of such Act shall not apply.

(c) INDIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Government Accountability Office shall conduct a study and, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the study and recommendations.

(2) CONTENTS.—The study shall include an assessment of each of the following:

(A) the extent to which the programs and services identified are available to Indian communities with business and economic development, including manufacturing, physical infrastructure (such as telecommunications and broadband), community development, and facilities construction for such purposes by the Department of the Treasury, the capital needs of Indian Tribes, businesses, and communities related to economic development, the extent to which the programs and services overlap or are not available to Indian communities served, and the extent that similar programs have been used to assist non-Indian communities compared to the extent used for Indian communities.

(B) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The study shall assess and quantify the extent of assistance provided to non-Indian borrowers and to Indian (both Tribal and individual) borrowers according to the type of information and assistance as a percentage of need for Indian borrowers and for non-Indian borrowers, assistance to Indian borrowers and to non-Indian borrowers as a percentage of total applicants, and such assistance to Indian borrowers as individuals as compared to such assistance to Indian Tribes) through the loan programs, the loan guarantees, the capital needs of Indian Tribes, businesses, and communities related to economic development, the extent to which the programs and services overlap or are not available to Indian communities served, and the extent that similar programs have been used to assist non-Indian communities compared to the extent used for Indian communities.

(C) TAX INCENTIVES.—The study shall assess and quantify the extent of the assistance and allocations afforded for non-Indian projects and for Indian projects pursuant to each of the following tax incentive programs:

(i) New market tax credit.

(ii) Low income housing tax credit.

(iii) Investment tax credit.

(iv) Renewable energy tax incentives.

(v) Accelerated depreciation.

(2) ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT.—

(A) INDIAN ECONOMIC ENTERPRISE.—The term ‘Indian economic enterprise’ has the meaning given the term in section 1480.201 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(B) MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.—

(i) The term ‘mentor firm’ and ‘protege firm’ have the meanings given those terms in section 1480.103 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(ii) INCREASE OR DECREASE IN TOTAL DOLLAR VALUE AND NUMBER OF PURCHASES AND AWARDS MADE WITHIN EACH AGENCY REGION, AS COMPARED TO THE TOTALS OF THE REGION FOR THE PRECEDING FISCAL YEAR.

(iii) The term ‘Secretary’ means—

(A) the Secretary of the Interior; and

(B) the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(iv) BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless determined by one of the Secretaries to be impracticable and unreasonable—

(A) Indian labor shall be employed; and

(B) Indian economic enterprises (including printing and facilities construction, notwithstanding any other provision of law) shall be made in open market by the Secretaries.

(2) MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Participation in the Mentor-Protege Program established under section 831(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note; Public Law 101–510) shall not render any individual or entity involved in the provision of Indian labor or an Indian industry product ineligible to receive assistance under this section.

(B) TREATMENT.—For purposes of this section, any description of the terms and conditions of the Mentor-Protege Program shall not render any individual or entity involved in the provision of Indian labor or an Indian industry product ineligible to receive assistance under this section.

(C) IMPLEMENTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretaries shall—

(1) conduct outreach to Indian enterprises;

(2) provide training;

(3) promulgate regulations in accordance with this section and with the regulations under part 480 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), to harmonize the procurement procedures of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Health and Human Services, to the maximum extent practicable.

(4) require regional offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service to aggregate data regarding compliance with this section;

(5) require procurement management reviews by their respective Departments to include a review of the implementation of this section; and

(6) consult with Indian Tribes, Indian industrial entities, and other stakeholders regarding methods to facilitate compliance with—

(A) this section; and

(B) other small business or procurement goals.

(4) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, each of the Secretaries shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing, during the period covered by the report, the implementation of this section by each of the respective Secretaries.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report under this subsection shall include, for each fiscal year during the period covered by the report—

(A) the names of each agency under the respective jurisdiction of each of the Secretaries to which this section has been applied, and efforts made by additional agencies to which this section has been applied, to improve the procurement procedures under this Act;

(B) a summary of the types of purchases made, and contracts awarded, including any relevant modifications, extensions, or renewals awarded to, Indian economic enterprises, expressed by agency region;

(C) a description of the percentage increase or decrease in total dollar value and number of purchases and awards made within each agency region, as compared to the totals of the region for the preceding fiscal year;

(D) a description of the methods used by applicable contracting officers and employing entities under this section, and the methods employed to improve the procurement procedures under this Act;

(E) a summary of all deviations granted under section 1480.403 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), including a description of—

(i) the types of alternative procurement methods used, including any Indian owned business entities reported under other procurement goals; and

(ii) the dollar value of any awards made pursuant to those deviations;

(F) a summary of the number and value of all purchases of, and contracts awarded for, supplies, services, and
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construction (including the percentage increase or decrease, as compared to the preceding fiscal year) from—

(I) Indian economic enterprises; and

(II) non-Indian economic enterprises;

(H) any administrative, procedural, legal, or other barriers to achieving the purposes of this section, together with recommendations for legislative or administrative actions to address those barriers; and

(I) for each agency region—

(1) the total amount spent on purchases made from, and contracts awarded to, Indian economic enterprises; and

(2) a comparison of the amount described in clause (1) to the total amount that the agency region would likely have spent on the same purchases made from a non-Indian economic enterprise or contracts awarded to a non-Indian economic enterprise.

(e) Goals.—Each agency shall establish an annual minimum percentage goal for procurement in compliance with this section.

SEC. 5. NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS ACT OF 1974.

(a) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR NATIVE AMERICAN PROJECTS.—Section 803 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991b) is amended—

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

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

‘‘(b) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.—

‘‘(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner may give priority to any application described in subsection (a), the Commissioner shall give priority to any application submitted by—

(A) the development of a Tribal code or court system for purposes of economic development, including commercial codes, training for court personnel, regulation pursuant to section 5 of the Act of August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. 200, chapter 289; 25 U.S.C. 261), and the development of nonprofit subsidiaries or other business enterprises;

(B) the development of a community development financial institution, including training and administrative expenses; or

(C) the development of a Tribal center plan for community and economic development and infrastructure.’’;

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—Section 804 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991c) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ‘‘The Commissioner’’ and inserting the following:

‘‘(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner’’; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(b) PRIORITY.—With regard to not less than 50 percent of the total amount available for assistance under this section, the Commissioner shall give priority to any application submitted by—

(A) the development of a Tribal code or court system for purposes of economic development, including commercial codes, training for court personnel, regulation pursuant to section 5 of the Act of August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. 200, chapter 289; 25 U.S.C. 261), and the development of nonprofit subsidiaries or other business enterprises;

(B) the development of a community development financial institution, including training and administrative expenses; or

(C) the development of a Tribal center plan for community and economic development and infrastructure.’’;

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 816 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d) is amended—

(1) by striking ‘‘803(d)’’ each place it appears and inserting ‘‘803(e)’’; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner shall give priority to any application described in section 803(b)(2).’’;

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—Section 804 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991c) is amended—

(1) by striking ‘‘803(d)’’ each place it appears and inserting ‘‘803(e)’’; and

(2) by striking ‘‘tribe’’ each place the term appears and inserting ‘‘Tribe’’;

(3) by striking ‘‘tribes’’ each place the term appears and inserting ‘‘Tribes’’; and

(4) by striking ‘‘tribal’’ each place the term appears and inserting ‘‘Tribal’’.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following Calendar items, en bloc: Calendar Nos. 110, 41, 73, 42, 64, 49, 34, 57, and 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills, en bloc.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following Calendar items, en bloc: Calendar Nos. 110, 41, 73, 42, 64, 49, 34, 57, and 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills, en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 275) to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans, and for other purposes.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 216) to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 224) to establish a business incubators program within the Department of the Interior to promote economic development in Indian reservation communities.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 832) to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 224) to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska, and to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 224) to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska, and to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska, and for other purposes.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 209) to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 256) to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 294) to establish a business incubators program within the Department of
this Act as the ‘Secretary’) shall convey to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska (referred to in this section as the ‘Council’), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in subsection (b) for use in connection with health and social services programs.

(2) EFFECT ON ANY QUIET CLAIM DEED.—The conveyance by the Secretary of title by warranty deed under this subsection shall, on the effective date of the conveyance, supersede and render of no further effect any quiet claim deed to the property described in subsection (b) executed by the Secretary and the Council.

(3) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance of the property under this section—

(A) shall be made by warranty deed; and

(B) shall not—

(i) require any consideration from the Corporation for the property;

(ii) impose any reversionary interest of the United States in the property.

(4) ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Corporation shall not be liable for any soil, surface water, groundwater, or other contamination resulting from disposal, release, or presence of any hazardous materials, hazardous waste, pollutants, toxic substances, solid waste, or any other environmental contamination or hazard as defined in any Federal or State of Alaska law.

(B) EASEMENT.—The Secretary shall be accorded any easement or access to the property conveyed under this section as may be reasonably necessary to satisfy any retained obligation or liability of the Secretary.

(5) NOTICE OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE ACTIVITY AND WARRANTY.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall comply with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)).

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO THE BRISTOL BAY AREA HEALTH CORPORATION.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable, but not later than 180 days, after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska (referred to in this section as the ‘Corporation’), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in subsection (b) for use in connection with health and social services programs.

(2) EFFECT ON ANY QUIET CLAIM DEED.—The conveyance by the Secretary of title by warranty deed under this subsection shall, on the effective date of the conveyance, supersede and render of no further effect any quiet claim deed to the property described in subsection (b) executed by the Secretary and the Corporation.

(3) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance of the property under this section—

(A) shall be made by warranty deed; and

(B) shall not—

(i) require any consideration from the Corporation for the property;

(ii) impose any reversionary interest of the United States in the property.

(4) ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Corporation shall not be liable for any soil, surface water, groundwater, or other contamination resulting from disposal, release, or presence of any environmental contamination on any portion of the property described in subsection (b) on or before the date on which the property is conveyed to the Corporation.

(B) ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION.—An environmental contamination described in subparagraph (A) includes any oil or petroleum products, hazardous substances, hazardous materials, hazardous waste, pollutants, toxic substances, solid waste, or any other environmental contamination or hazard as defined in any Federal or State of Alaska law.

(C) EASEMENT.—The Secretary shall be accorded any easement or access to the property conveyed under this section as may be reasonably necessary to satisfy any retained obligation or liability of the Secretary.

(5) NOTICE OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE ACTIVITY AND WARRANTY.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall comply with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)).

S. 209
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ‘Practical Reforms and Other Goals To Reinforce the Effectiveness of Self-Governance and Self-Determination for Indian Tribes Act of 2019’ or the ‘PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act’.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Tribal self-governance.

Sec. 3. Administrative provisions.

Sec. 4. Contracting for goods, services, and facilities.

Sec. 5. Contract or grant specifications.

TITLE I—TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE

SEC. 101. TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE.

(a) EFFECTS OF THE PROVISIONS—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed—

(1) to modify, limit, expand, or otherwise affect—

(A) the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, as provided for under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act), regarding—

(i) the inclusion of any non-BIA program (as defined in section 401(2) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act) in a self-determination contract or funding agreement under section 403(c) of such Act (as so in effect); or

(ii) the implementation of any contract or agreement described in clause (i) that is in effect on the day described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 403(c) of such Act; or

(B) the meaning, application, or effect of any Tribal water rights settlement, including the performance required of a party thereto or any payment or funding obligation thereunder;

(C) the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of a State to manage, control, or regulate fish and wildlife under State law (including regulations) on land or water in the State, including Federal public land;

(D) except for the authority provided to the Corporation as described in subparagraph (A), the applicability or effect of any Federal law related to the protection or management of fish or wildlife; or

(E) any treaty-right held or right other than that of the United States as recognized by any other means, including treaties or agreements with the United States, Executive orders, statutes, regulations, or case law; or

(2) to authorize any provision of a contract or agreement that is not consistent with the terms of a Tribal water rights settlement.

SEC. 102. CONSTRUCTION.

(1) IN GENERAL.—The terms ‘Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act’ (25 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

‘SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.

‘In this title:

‘(1) COMPACT.—The term ‘compact’ means a self-governance compact entered into under section 404.

‘(2) CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM; CONSTRUCTION PROJECT.—The term ‘construction program’ or ‘construction project’ means a Tribal under determination program, or part thereof, as described in paragraph (1) of section 402 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (as defined in section 401 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, as so defined).

‘(3) DEPARTMENT.—The term ‘Department’ means the Department of the Interior.

‘(4) FUNDING AGREEMENT.—The term ‘funding agreement’ means a funding agreement entered into under section 403.

‘(5) GROSS MISMANAGEMENT.—The term ‘gross mismanagement’ means a significant violation, shown by a preponderance of the evidence, of a compact, funding agreement, or statutory or regulatory requirement applicable to Federal funds for a program administered by an Indian Tribe under a compact or funding agreement.

‘(6) INHERENT FEDERAL FUNCTION.—The term ‘inherent Federal function’ means a Federal function that may not legally be delegated to an Indian Tribe.

‘(7) NON-BIA PROGRAM.—The term ‘non-BIA program’ means all or a portion of a program, function, service, or activity that is administered by any bureau, service, office, or component of the Department of the Interior other than—

(A) the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(2) to authorize any provision of a contract or agreement that is not consistent with the terms of a Tribal water rights settlement.

(3) DEPARTMENT.—The term ‘Department’ means the Department of the Interior.

(4) FUNDING AGREEMENT.—The term ‘funding agreement’ means a funding agreement entered into under section 403.

(5) GROSS MISMANAGEMENT.—The term ‘gross mismanagement’ means a significant violation, shown by a preponderance of the evidence, of a compact, funding agreement, or statutory or regulatory requirement applicable to Federal funds for a program administered by an Indian Tribe under a compact or funding agreement.

(6) INHERENT FEDERAL FUNCTION.—The term ‘inherent Federal function’ means a Federal function that may not legally be delegated to an Indian Tribe.

(7) NON-BIA PROGRAM.—The term ‘non-BIA program’ means all or a portion of a program, function, service, or activity that is administered by any bureau, service, office, or component of the Department of the Interior other than—

(A) the Bureau of Indian Affairs;
"(B) the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs; or
"(C) the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians.

(7) Joint participation.—The term 'program' means any program, function, service, or activity (or portion thereof) within the Department that is included in a funding agreement.

(8) Participation.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(9) Self-determination contract.—The term 'self-determination contract' means a self-determination contract entered into under section 102.

(10) Tribal Water Rights Settlement.—The term 'Tribal water rights settlement' means any settlement, compact, or other agreement expressly ratified or approved by an Act of Congress.

(A) includes an Indian Tribe and the United States as parties; and
(B) quantifies or otherwise defines any water right of the Indian Tribe.

(c) Establishment.—Section 402 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5363) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 402. TRIBAL SELF-DETERMINATION GOVERNMENT.

"(a) Establishment.—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a program within the Department by the term known as the 'Tribal Self-Governance Program.'

"(b) Selection of Participating Indian Tribes.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) Eligibility.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Office of Self-Governance, may select not more than 50 new self-governance Indian Tribes per year from those tribes eligible under subsection (c) to participate in self-governance.

"(B) Joint Participation.—On the request of each Indian Tribe, the Secretary may elect to treat otherwise eligible Indian Tribes may be treated as a single Indian Tribe for the purpose of participating in self-governance.

"(C) VOTED INDIAN TRIBES OR TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—If an Indian Tribe authorizes another Indian Tribe or a Tribal organization to plan for or carry out a program on its behalf under this title, the authorized Indian Tribe or Tribal organization shall have the rights and responsibilities of the authorizing Indian Tribe (except as otherwise provided per paragraph (a)(1)(B)).

"(D) Joint Participation as Organization.—Two or more Indian Tribes that are not otherwise eligible under subsection (c) may be treated as a single Indian Tribe for the purpose of participating in self-governance as a Tribal organization if—

"(A) each Indian Tribe so requests; and
"(B) the Tribal organization itself, or at least one of the Indian Tribes participating in the Tribal organization, is eligible under subsection (c).

"(E) Election of withdrawal from a Tribal organization.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe that withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization in part, shall be entitled to participate in self-governance if the Indian Tribe is eligible under subsection (c).

"(B) EFFECT OF WITHDRAWAL.—If an Indian Tribe withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization, the Indian Tribe shall be entitled to its Tribal share of funds and resources under the program until the date that the Indian Tribe is entitled to carry out under the compact and funding agreement of the Indian Tribe.

"(C) Participation in self-governance.—The withdrawal of an Indian Tribe from a Tribal organization shall not affect the eligibility of the Tribal organization to participate in a Tribal organization on behalf of one or more other Indian Tribes, if the Tribal organization still qualifies under subsection (c).

"(D) Withdrawal.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe may, by Tribal resolution, fully or partially withdraw its Tribal share of any program in a funding agreement from a participating Tribal organization.

"(2) Notification.—The Indian Tribe shall provide a copy of the Tribal resolution described in clause (1) to the Secretary.

"(3) Effective Date.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A withdrawal under clause (i) shall become effective on the date that is specified in the Tribal resolution and mutually agreed upon by the Secretary, the withdrawing Indian Tribe, and the Tribal organization that signed the compact and funding agreement of the withdrawing Indian Tribe or Tribal organization.

"(B) NO SPECIFIED DATE.—In the absence of a date specified in the resolution, the withdrawal shall become effective on—

"(aa) the earlier of—

"(AA) 1 year after the date of submission of the request; and
"(BB) the date on which the funding agreement expires; or

"(bb) such date as may be mutually agreed upon by the withdrawing Indian Tribe, and the Tribal organization that signed the compact and funding agreement on behalf of the withdrawing Indian Tribe or Tribal organization.

"(E) Distribution of funds.—If an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization eligible to enter into a self-determination contract or a compact or funding agreement fully or partially withdraws from a participating Tribal organization, the withdrawing Indian Tribe—

"(1) may elect to enter into a self-determination contract or compact, in which case—

"(a) the withdrawing Indian Tribe or Tribal organization shall be entitled to its Tribal share of unexpended funds and resources supporting the programs that the Indian Tribe will be carrying out under its own self-determination contract or compact and funding agreement (calculated on the same basis as the funds were initially allocated to the funding agreement of the Tribal organization); and

"(b) the funds referred to in clause (A) shall be withdrawn by the Secretary from the funding agreement of the Tribal organization and transferred to the withdrawing Indian Tribe, on the condition that sections 102 and 105(i), as appropriate, shall apply to the withdrawing Indian Tribe; or

"(ii) may elect not to enter into a self-determination contract or compact, in which case all unexpended funds and resources associated with the withdrawing Indian Tribe's returned programs (calculated on the same basis as the funds were initially allocated to the funding agreement of the Tribal organization) shall be returned by the Tribal organization to the Secretary for operation of the programs included in the withdrawal.

"(2) Return to mature contract status.—If an Indian Tribe elects to operate all or some programs under a compact or funding agreement under this title through a self-determination contract under title I, at the option of the Indian Tribe, the resulting self-determination contract shall be a mature self-determination contract as long as the Indian Tribe meets the requirements of paragraph (1).

"(c) Eligibility.—To be eligible to participate in self-governance, an Indian Tribe shall—

"(1) successfully complete the planning phase described in subsection (d);

"(2) request participation in self-governance by resolution or other official action by the Tribal governing body; and

"(3) demonstrate, for the 3 fiscal years preceding the date on which the Indian Tribe requests participation, financial stability and the financial ability to support the requested program, including—

"(A) to begin participation in self-governance; and

"(B) to negotiate the terms of participation with the Indian Tribe or Tribal organization in self-governance, as set forth in a compact and a funding agreement.

"(2) Recipient of grant not required.—Receipt of a grant under paragraph (1) shall not be a requirement of participation in self-governance.

"(3) Funding agreements.—Section 403 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5363) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Grants.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization that meets the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) is eligible for grants—

"(A) to plan for participation in self-governance; and

"(B) to negotiate the terms of participation with the Indian Tribe or Tribal organization in self-governance, as set forth in a compact and a funding agreement.

"(2) Receipt of grant not required.—Receipt of a grant under paragraph (1) shall not be a requirement of participation in self-governance.

"(d) Activities.—The planning phase shall—

"(A) be conducted to the satisfaction of the Indian Tribe; and

"(B) include—

"(i) an audit; and

"(ii) internal Tribal government planning, training, and organizational preparation.

"(e) General.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization that meets the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) is eligible for grants—

"(A) to plan for participation in self-governance; and

"(B) to negotiate the terms of participation with the Indian Tribe or Tribal organization in self-governance, as set forth in a compact and a funding agreement.

"(2) Receipt of grant not required.—Receipt of a grant under paragraph (1) shall not be a requirement of participation in self-governance.

"(3) Funding agreements.—Section 403 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5363) is amended—

"(4) Grants.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization that meets the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) is eligible for grants—

"(A) to plan for participation in self-governance; and

"(B) to negotiate the terms of participation with the Indian Tribe or Tribal organization in self-governance, as set forth in a compact and a funding agreement.

"(2) Receipt of grant not required.—Receipt of a grant under paragraph (1) shall not be a requirement of participation in self-governance.

"(3) Funding agreements.—Section 403 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5363) is amended—

"(A) Authorization.—The Secretary shall, on the request of any Indian Tribe or Tribal organization, negotiate and enter into a funding agreement with the governing body of the Indian Tribe or the Tribal organization in a manner consistent with—

"(i) the trust responsibility of the Federal Government, treaty obligations, and the government-to-government relationship between Indian Tribes and the United States; and

"(ii) the governance of the Indian Tribe or the Tribal organization in a manner consistent with—

"(F) return to mature contract status.—If an Indian Tribe elects to operate all or some programs under a compact or funding agreement under this title through a self-determination contract under
(I) in clause (i), as redesignated by clause (ii), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(ii) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by striking the semicolon and inserting "; and"; and

(v) by redesigning subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B);

(vi) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by clause (v), by striking the semicolon and inserting "; and"; and

(vii) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) any other program, service, function, or activity (or portion thereof) that is provided through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, or the Office of the Trustee for American Indians with respect to which Indian Tribes or Indians are primary or significant beneficiaries;"


(B) paragraphs (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), (vii), (viii), and (ix) of section 405(c)(1) and inserting "section 412(c)"; and

"(m) OTHER PROVISIONS.—

(1) EXCLUDED FUNDING.—A funding agreement shall not authorize an Indian Tribe to plan, conduct, administer, or receive Tribal share funding under any program that—

(A) a funding agreement shall remain in full force and effect until a subsequent funding agreement is executed, with funding paid annually for each fiscal year the agreement is in effect; and

(B) the term of the subsequent funding agreement shall be retroactive to the end of the term of the preceding funding agreement for the purposes of calculating the amount of funding to which the Indian Tribe is entitled.

(ii) such date as may be mutually agreed upon by the parties to the agreement; and

(iii) by inserting "and" after the semicolon;

(iv) by redesigning subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B);

(v) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by clause (iv), by striking the semicolon and inserting "; and"; and

(vi) by adding at the end the following:

"(n) AMENDMENT.—The Secretary shall not

(A) provide to an Indian Tribe under this title, as in effect on the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, shall have the option at any time after that date—

(i) to retain its negotiated compact (in whole or in part) to the extent that the provisions of the compact are not directly contrary to any express provision of this title; or

(ii) to negotiate a new compact in a manner consistent with this title.

SEC. 405. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) APPLICABILITY.—An Indian Tribe and the Secretary shall include in any compact or funding agreement provisions that reflect the provisions of the compact.

(b) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—An Indian Tribe participating in self-governance shall ensure that internal measures are in place to address, pursuant to the funding agreement and procedures, conflicts of interest in the administration of programs.

(c) AUDITS.—

(1) SINGLE AGENCY AUDIT ACT.—Chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code, shall apply to a funding agreement under this title.

(2) COST PRINCIPLES.—An Indian Tribe shall apply cost principles under the applicable Office of Management and Budget circular, except as modified by—

(A) any provision of law, including section 106(b);

(B) any exemptions to applicable Office of Management and Budget circulars subsequently granted by the Office of Management and Budget.

(3) FEDERAL CLAIMS.—Any claim by the Federal Government against an Indian Tribe relating to funds received under a funding agreement based on any audit under this subsection shall be subject to section 106(i).

(4) REDESIGN AND CONSOLIDATION.—Except as provided in section 407, an Indian Tribe may redesign or consolidate programs, or retain funds for programs within the compact or funding agreement in any manner that the Indian Tribe determines and which is not directly contrary to any express provision of this title.

(D) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3);

(e) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—Title IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5361 et seq.) is amended by striking sections 404 through 408 and inserting the following:

"SEC. 404. COMPACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall negotiate and enter into a written compact with each Indian Tribe participating in self-governance in a manner consistent with the trust responsibilities of the Federal Government, thereby establishing a government-to-government relationship between Indian Tribes and the United States.

(b) CONTENTS.—A compact under subsection (a) shall—

(1) specify and affirm the general terms of the government-to-government relationship between the Indian Tribe and the Secretary; and

(2) include such terms as the parties intend shall control during the term of the compact.

(c) AMENDMENT.—A compact under subsection (a) may be amended only by agreement of the parties.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The effective date of a compact under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) the date of the execution of the compact; or

(2) such date as is mutually agreed upon by the parties.

(e) DURATION.—A compact under subsection (a) shall remain in effect—

(1) for so long as permitted by Federal law; or

(2) until termination by written agreement between the parties.

(f) EXISTING COMPACTS.—An Indian Tribe participating in self-governance under this title, as on the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, shall have the option at any time after that date—

(1) to retain its negotiated compact (in whole or in part) to the extent that the provisions of the compact are not directly contrary to any express provision of this title; or

(2) to negotiate a new compact in a manner consistent with this title.
(1) shall not be entitled to contract with the Secretary for funds under section 102, except that the Indian Tribe shall be eligible for new programs on the same basis as other Indian Tribes; and

(2) shall be responsible for the administration of programs in accordance with the compact or funding agreement.

§ 405(b)(3)—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless an Indian Tribe specifies otherwise in the compact or funding agreement, an Indian Tribe shall not be considered to be Federal records for purposes of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) RECORDKEEPING SYSTEM.—An Indian Tribe shall:

(A) maintain a recordkeeping system; and

(B) on a notice period of not less than 30 days, provide the Secretary with reasonable access to the records to enable the Department to meet the requirements of sections 3301 through 3306 of title 44, United States Code.

§ 406. PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE SECRETARY.

(a) Trust Evaluations.—A funding agreement shall include a provision to monitor the performance of trust functions by the Indian Tribe through the annual trust evaluation.

(b) Reassessment.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A compact or funding agreement shall include provisions for the Secretary to review and make a determination with respect to a final offer within the period specified in paragraph (2), including any extension agreed to under paragraph (3), the Secretary in a final offer to have agreed to offer, except that with respect to any compact or funding agreement provision concerning program services or carryout under section 403(h), the Secretary shall be deemed to have rejected the offer with respect to such provision and the terms of clauses (i) through (iv) of paragraphs (6)(A) shall apply.

(2) EXTENSIONS.—The deadline described in paragraph (2) may be extended for any length of time, as agreed to by both the Indian Tribe and the Secretary.

(3) Designated Officials.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate one or more appropriate officials in the Department to receive a copy of the final offer described in paragraph (1).

(B) No Designation.—If no official is designated, the Director of the Office of the Executive Secretariat and Regulatory Affairs shall be the designated official.

(4) TIMELY DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary fails to make a determination with respect to a final offer within the period specified in paragraph (2), including any extension agreed to under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall be deemed to have rejected the final offer described in paragraph (1).

(5) SAVINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Unless an Indian Tribe participates in self-governance under section 402(c), the Secretary shall be deemed to have exercised its right to reject the final offer for a reassumption under subsection (b); and

(B) EXTENSION.—The deadlines provided in subsection (b) shall be extended for any length of time, as agreed to by both the Secretary and the Indian Tribe.

§ 407. Construction Programs and Projects.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Indian Tribes participating in Tribal self-governance may carry
out any construction project included in a compact or funding agreement under this title.

(b) Tribal Option To Carry Out Certain Federal, Environmental, Activities.—In carrying out a construction project under this title, an Indian Tribe may, subject to the agreement of the Secretary, elect to assume some Federal responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code, and related provisions of other law and regulations that would apply if the Secretary were to undertake a construction project, by adopting a resolution—

(1) designating a certifying Tribal official to represent the Indian Tribe and to assume the status of a responsible Federal official under those Acts, laws, or regulations; and

(2) accepting the jurisdiction of the United States courts for the purpose of enforcing the responsibilities of the certifying Tribal official assuming the status of a responsible Federal official under those Acts, laws, or regulations.

(3) Savinos Clause.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary to include in any compact or funding agreement duties of the Secretary under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code, and other related provisions of law and Federal regulations.

(d) Codes and Standards.—In carrying out a construction project under this title, an Indian Tribe shall—

(1) adhere to applicable Federal, State, local, and Tribal building codes, architectural and engineering standards, and applicable Federal guidelines regarding design, space, and structural specifications; appropriate for the particular project; and

(2) use only architects and engineers—

(A) who are licensed to practice in the State in which the facility will be built; and

(B) who certify that—

(i) they are qualified to perform the work required by the specific construction involved; and

(ii) upon completion of design, the plans and specifications meet or exceed the applicable construction standards.

(e) Tribal Accountability.—

(1) In general.—Carrying out a construction project under this title, the Indian Tribe shall—

(A) designate a certifying Tribal official to represent the Indian Tribe and to assume the status of a responsible Federal official under those Acts, laws, or regulations, including the scope of work, references to design criteria, and other terms and conditions; and

(C) the responsibilities of the Indian Tribe and the Secretary shall be addressed;

(D) how project-related environmental considerations will be addressed;

(E) the amount of funds provided for the project; and

(F) the obligations of the Indian Tribe to comply with the codes referenced in subsection (d)(1) and applicable Federal laws and regulations;

(G) the agreement of the parties over who will bear any additional costs necessary to meet changes in scope, or errors or omissions in design and construction; and

(H) the agreement of the Secretary to issue a certificate of occupancy, if requested by the Indian Tribe, upon review and verification by the Secretary, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that the Indian Tribe has secured upon completion the required permits, licenses, inspections, and certifications, and the facility is usable for the successful completion of the construction project; and

(i) the agreement of the Tribe to assume responsibility for the successful completion of the construction project and of a facility that is usable for the successful completion of the construction project; and

(ii) the agreement of the Tribe to comply with the applicable Federal guidelines regarding design, space, and structural specifications; appropriate for the particular project; and

(j) Future Funding.—Upon completion of a facility constructed under this title, the Secretary shall include in funding agreements annual or semiannual advance payments at the option of the Indian Tribe.

(2) Advance Payments.—The Secretary shall include all associated project contingency funds with each advance payment, and the Indian Tribe shall be responsible for the management of such contingency funds.

(3) Reporting.—At the option of the Secretary, the Indian Tribe shall provide the Secretary with project progress and financial reports not less than semiannually.

(4) Oversight Visits.—The Secretary may conduct visits semiannually or on an alternate schedule agreed to by the Secretary and the Indian Tribe.

(5) Application of Laws.—Unless otherwise agreed to by the Indian Tribe and except as otherwise provided in this Act, no provision of title 41, United States Code, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, or any other applicable law of the Federal Government (including Executive orders) shall apply to any construction program or project carried out under this title.

(6) Future Funding.—Upon completion of a facility constructed under this title, the Secretary shall include the facility among those eligible for annual operation and maintenance funding support comparable to that provided for similar facilities funded by the Department as annual appropriations in a Federal procurement (including Executive orders) and shall apply to any construction program or project carried out under this title.

(a) Indian Title.—Subject to subsection (e) and sections 403 and 405, the Secretary shall provide funds to the Indian Tribe under a funding agreement for programs in an amount equal to the amount that the Indian Tribe would have been entitled to receive under contracts and grants under this Act (including amounts for direct program costs), and in addition, any funds that are specifically or functionally related to the provision by the Secretary of services and benefits to the Indian Tribe, other than those eligible for annual operation and maintenance funding, shall be transferred to the Indian Tribe without regard to the organization level within the Department at which the programs are carried out.

(ii) Savings Clause.—Nothing in this section reduces programs, services, or funds of, or provided to, another Indian Tribe.

(7) Timings.—

(1) in General.—Subject to the terms of any compact or funding agreement entered into under this title, the Secretary shall transfer to the Indian Tribe all funds provided for in the funding agreement, pursuant to subsection (c), and provide funding for periods covered by joint resolution adopted by Congress making continuing appropriations, to the extent permitted by law.

(8) Transfers.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indians Act, in any fiscal year which a compact requires an annual transfer of funding to be made at the beginning of a fiscal year or requires semiannual or other periodic transfers of funds to be made at the beginning of a fiscal year, the first such transfer shall be made not later than 10 days after the apportionment of such funds by the Office of Management and Budget to the Department, unless the funding agreement provides otherwise.

(9) Accountability.—Funds provided to Indian Tribe as annual or semiannual advance payments shall be available to individual Indians only to the extent that the same services that would have been provided by the Secretary are provided to individual Indians by the Indian Tribe.

(f) Multiyear Funding.—A funding agreement may provide for multiyear funding.

(g) Limitations on Authority of the Secretary.—The Secretary shall not—

(1) fail to transfer to an Indian Tribe its share of any central, headquarters, regional, area, or service unit office or other funds due under this title for programs eligible under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 406, except as required by law;

(2) withhold any portion of such funds for transfer over a period of years; or

(3) reduce the amount of funds required under this title—

(A) to make funding available for self-governance monitoring or administration by the Secretary;

(B) in subsequent years, except as necessary as a result of—

(i) a reduction in appropriations from the previous fiscal year for the program to be included in a compact or funding agreement; and

(ii) a congressional directive in legislation or an accompanying report;

(iii) a Tribal authorization;

(iv) a change in the amount of pass-through funds subject to the terms of the funding agreement; or

(v) completion of an activity under a program for which the funding is provided;

(C) to pay for Federal functions, including—

(i) Federal pay costs;

(ii) Federal employee retirement benefits;

(iii) automated data processing;

(iv) technical assistance; and

(v) monitoring of activities under this title;

(D) to pay for costs of Federal personnel displaced by self-determination contracts
under this Act or self-governance under this title.

"(b) FEDERAL RESOURCES.—If an Indian Tribe elects to carry out a compact or funding agreement use of Federal personnel, Federal supplies (including supplies available from Federal warehouse facilities), Federal supply sources (including lodging, airline, and other means of transportation, including the use of interagency motor pool vehicles), or other Federal resources (including supplies, services, and real property) shall be available to the Secretary under any procurement contracts in which the Department is eligible to participate, the Indian Tribe shall—

(1) acquire and transfer such personnel, supplies, or resources to the Indian Tribe under this title.

(2) DISSECT PAYMENT ACT.—Chapter 38 of title 31, United States Code, shall apply to the transfer of funds due under a compact or funding agreement authorized under this title.

(3) INTEREST OR OTHER INCOME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe may retain interest or income earned on any funds paid under a compact or funding agreement to carry out governmental purposes.

(2) NO EFFECT ON OTHER AMOUNTS.—The retention of interest or income under paragraph (1) shall not diminish the amount of funds provided for a specific purpose under any provision of an appropriations Act, all funds provided in section 201(d) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, or all funds paid to an Indian Tribe in accordance with a specific agreement, including agreements authorized under this title.

(3) INVESTMENT STANDARDS.—Funds transferred under this title shall be managed by the Indian Tribe using the prudent investment standards provided that the Secretary shall not be liable for any investment losses of funds managed by the Indian Tribe that are not otherwise guaranteed or insured by the Federal Government.

(4) CAREER DEVELOPMENT.—If an Indian Tribe elects to carry over funds from one year to the next, the career development account shall not diminish the amount of funds the Indian Tribe is entitled to receive under a funding agreement in the year the interest or income is earned or in any subsequent fiscal year.

(5) EXTENSIONS.—The deadline described in paragraph (2) may be extended for any length of time, as agreed upon by both the Indian Tribe and the Secretary.

(6) DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—Not later than 120 days after receipt by the Secretary and the designated officials under paragraph (4) of a request under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall approve or deny the request.

(7) GROUNDS FOR DENIAL.—The Secretary may deny a request under paragraph (1) upon a specific finding that the request is unlawful or that the request is not in the best interest of the United States.

(8) FAILURE TO MAKE DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary determines, in consultation with Indian Tribes, that a request is unlawful or not in the best interest of the United States, the Secretary shall notify the Indian Tribe of the determination.

(9) NOTICE OF INSUFFICIENCY.—The retention of interest or income under paragraph (1) shall not diminish the amount of funds the Secretary shall approve or deny the request.

(10) LIMITATION OF COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe shall not be obligated to continue performance that requires an expenditure of funds in excess of the amount of funds transferred under a compact or funding agreement.

(2) NOTICE OF INSUFFICIENCY.—If at any time the Indian Tribe has reason to believe that the total amount provided for a specific activity under the compact or funding agreement is insufficient, the Indian Tribe shall provide reasonable notice of such insufficiency to the Secretary.

(3) NOTICE OF INADEQUATE PERFORMANCE.—If, after notice under paragraph (2), the Secretary does not increase the amount of funds transferred under the funding agreement, the Indian Tribe may suspend performance of the compact or funding agreement until such time as additional funds are transferred.

(4) REQUEST FOR WAIVER.—Nothing in this section reduces any programs, services, or funds of, or provided to, another Indian Tribe.

(5) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—The Office of Self-Governance shall be responsible for distribution of all Bureau of Indian Affairs funds provided under this title unless otherwise agreed by the parties to an applicable funding agreement.

(6) APPLICABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act applies to subsections (a) through (m).

SEC. 408. FACILITATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by law, by section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, the Secretary shall interpret each Federal law and regulation in a manner that facilitates—

(1) the implementation of programs in funding agreements; and

(2) the implementation of funding agreements.

(b) REGULATION WAIVER.—

(1) REQUEST.—An Indian Tribe may submit to the Secretary a written request for a waiver of applicability of a Federal regulation, including—

(A) an identification of the specific text in the regulation sought to be waived; and

(B) the basis for the request.

(2) DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall designate one or more appropriate officials in the Department to receive a copy of the waiver request described in paragraph (1).

(3) EXTENSIONS.—The deadline described in paragraph (2) may be extended for any length of time, as agreed upon by both the Indian Tribe and the Secretary.

(4) DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—An Indian Tribe may request a determination in writing from the Secretary that the total amount provided for a specific purpose under any provision of an appropriations Act, all funds provided in section 201(d) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, or all funds provided in section 406(b)(2) or section 406(c), the Secretary shall be deemed to have denied the request.

(b) REQUEST FOR WAIVER.—The Secretary may deny a request under paragraph (1) upon a specific finding that the request is unlawful or not in the best interest of the United States.

(c) EXTENSIONS.—The deadline described in paragraph (2) may be extended for any length of time, as agreed upon by both the Indian Tribe and the Secretary.

(d) DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—An Indian Tribe may request a determination in writing from the Secretary that the total amount provided for a specific purpose under any provision of an appropriations Act, all funds provided in section 201(d) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, or all funds provided in section 406(b)(2) or section 406(c), the Secretary shall be deemed to have denied the request.

(7) FINALITY.—A decision of the Secretary under this section shall be final for the Department.

SEC. 410. DISCRETIONARY APPLICATION OF OTHER SECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in section 409 of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, at the option of a participating Indian Tribe or Indian Tribes, any of the provisions of this section may be incorporated in any compact or funding agreement under this title. The inclusion of any such provision shall be subject to, and shall not conflict with, section 101(a) of such Act.

(2) EFFECT.—Each incorporated provision under subsection (a) shall—

(1) have the force and effect as if set out in full in this title;

(2) supplement or replace any related provision in this title; and

(3) apply to any agency otherwise governed by the Department.

(b) EFFECT.—Each incorporated provision under subsection (a) shall—

(1) have the force and effect as if set out in full in this title;

(2) supplement or replace any related provision in this title; and

(3) apply to any agency otherwise governed by the Department.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—If an Indian Tribe requests incorporation at the negotiation stage of a compact or funding agreement, the incorporation shall—

(1) be effective immediately; and

(2) control the negotiation and resulting compact or funding agreement.

SEC. 411. ANNUAL BUDGET LIST.

The Secretary shall list, in the annual budget request submitted to Congress under section 301(a) of United States Code, any funds proposed to be included in funding agreements authorized under this title.

SEC. 412. REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—On January 1 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report regarding the administration of this title.

(2) ANALYSIS.—Any Indian Tribe may submit to the Office of Self-Governance and to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed annual analysis of unmet Tribal needs for funding agreements under this title.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall—

(1) be compiled from information contained in funding agreements, annual audit results, and data from the Secretary regarding the disposition of Federal funds;

(2) identify—

(A) the relative costs and benefits of self-governance; and

(B) with particularity, all funds that are specifically or functionally related to the provision by the Secretary of services and benefits to self-governance Indian Tribes and members of Indian Tribes;

(c) THE FUNDS TRANSFERRED TO EACH INDIAN TRIBE AND THE CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND WORKLOAD;

(d) THE FUNDING FUNDING FOR INDIVIDUAL TRIBAL SHARES OF ALL CENTRAL OFFICE FUNDS, TOGETHER WITH THE COMBINED FUNDS OF THE INDIAN TRIBES, DEVELOPED UNDER SUBSECTION (d);

(3) BEFORE BEING SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS, BE DISTRIBUTED TO THE INDIAN TRIBES FOR COMMENT WITH A COMMENT PERIOD OF NOT LESS THAN 30 DAYS;

(4) INCLUDE THE SEPARATE VIEWS AND COMMENTS OF EACH INDIAN TRIBE OR TRIBAL ORGANIZATION; AND

(5) INCLUDE A LIST OF—

(A) ALL SUCH PROGRAMS THAT THE SECRETARY DETERMINES, IN CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES AND OTHER PARTIES PARTICIPATING IN SELF-GOVERNANCE, ARE ELIGIBLE FOR NEGO T IAT ION TO BE INCLUDED IN A FUNDING AGREEMENT AT THE REQUEST OF A PARTICIPATING INDIAN TRIBE; AND

(B) ALL SUCH PROGRAMS WHICH INDIAN TRIBES HAVE FORMALLY REQUESTED TO INCLUDE IN A FUNDING AGREEMENT UNDER SECTION 406(c) DUE TO THE SPECIAL GEOGRAPHICAL, HISTORICAL, OR CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROGRAM TO THE INDIAN TRIBE, INDICATING WHETHER EACH REQUEST WAS GRANTED OR DENIED, AND STATING THE GROUNDS FOR ANY DENIAL;

(c) REPORT ON NON-BIA PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—IN ORDER TO OPTIMIZE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INCLUDING NON-BIA PROGRAMS IN FUNDING AGREEMENTS WITH INDIAN TRIBES PARTICIPATING IN SELF-GOVERNANCE, TO ENCOURAGE BUREAUS OF THE DEPARTMENT TO ENSURE THAT AN APPROPRIATE PORTION OF THOSE PROGRAMS ARE AVAILABLE TO BE INCLUDED IN FUNDING AGREEMENTS;

(2) PROGRAMMATIC TARGETS.—The Secretary shall establish programmatic targets, after consultation with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, to encourage bureaus of the Department to ensure that an appropriate portion of those programs are available to be included in funding agreements with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance.

(3) PUBLICATION.—The lists under subsection (b)(5) and targets under paragraph (2) shall be published in the Federal Register and made available to any Indian Tribe participating in self-governance.

(4) ANNUAL REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall annually review and publish in the Federal Register, after consultation with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, revised lists and programmatic targets.

(B) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall annually review and publish in the Federal Register, after consultation with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, revised lists and programmatic targets.

SEC. 413. SELF-GOVERNANCE IMPLEMENTATION OF OTHER SECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in section 409 of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, at the option of a participating Indian Tribe or Indian Tribes, any of the provisions of this section may be incorporated in any compact or funding agreement under this title. The inclusion of any such provision shall be subject to, and shall not conflict with, section 101(a) of such Act.
eligible for contracting in the original list published in the Federal Register in 1995, except for programs specifically determined not to be contractible as a matter of law.

"(d) regulations promulgated pursuant to this title shall supersede any conflicting regulations promulgated by the Secretaries of the Interior to which the Tribal government.

"(3) EFFECTIVENESS WITHOUT REGARD TO REGULATIONS.—The lack of promulgated regulations on an issue shall not limit the effect or implementation of this title.

"SEC. 414. EFFECT OF CIRCULARS, POLICIES, MANUALS, GUIDANCE, AND RULES.—

"(a) UNLESS EXPRESSLY AGREED TO.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with Indian Tribes, develop a funding formula to determine the individual Tribal shares of funds controlled by the Central Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of the Special Trustee for inclusion in the compacts.

"(b) ADOPTION OF PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall adapt the negotiated rulemaking procedures to the unique context of self-governance and the government-to-government relationship between the United States and Indian Tribes.

"(c) EFFECT.—The Secretary may repeal any regulation that is inconsistent with this Act.

"(2) CONFLICTING PROVISIONS.—Subject to section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act and in self-determination and any ambiguity shall be resolved in favor of the Indian Tribe.

"(d) ADOPTION OF PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall adapt the negotiated rulemaking procedures to the unique context of self-governance and the government-to-government relationship between the United States and Indian Tribes.

"(2) COMMITTEE.—(A) in subparagraph (B) of subsection (b), by striking '' 'tribal Tribe' or 'Indian Tribe' means''; and

"(d) EFFECT.—(1) in subsection (b), by striking '' 'tribal Tribe' or 'Indian Tribe' means''; and

"(B) in subsection (l), by striking '' 'tribal Tribe' or 'Indian Tribe' means''; and

"(c) E FFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall not take effect until 14 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(d) APPLICATION OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Sections 105(f)(1), 110, and 111 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304, 5305, 5306, 5307, 5321(c), 5323, 5324(a)(1), 5324(f), 5324(c), 5331, 5333, and 5334 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991 (Public Law 101–512; 104 Stat. 1959), apply to compacts and funding agreements entered into under this title.

"(e) REPORTING AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 5 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5305) is amended—

"SEC. 202. CONTRACTS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—

"Section 102 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5321) is amended—

"(3) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''ecological enterprises'' and all that follows that is inserted by such amendment except that "ecological enterprises (as defined in section 3 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1462), except that''; and

"(b) Funds associated with those programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof); and

"(2) the implementation of self-determination contracts and funding agreements; and

"(A) applicable programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof); and

"(B) funds associated with those programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof); and

"(2) the implementation of self-determination contracts and funding agreements; and

"(d) the consistency of the decision with the requirements and policies of this title.

"SEC. 416. APPLICATION OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—


"SEC. 417. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

"There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title.

"TITLE II—INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION

"SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS; REPORTING AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS; APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—No later than January 1, 2020, the Secretary shall have as its members only representatives of the Federal Government and Tribal government.

"(B) COMMITTEE.—Not later than 30 months after the date of the enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall not take effect until 14 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(B) the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act.

"(A) the purposes specified in section 3; and

"(2) PUBLICATION OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS.—Proposed regulations to implement this title shall be published in the Federal Register not later than 21 months after the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act.

"(B) the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act.

"(A) the purposes specified in section 3; and

"(B) the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act.

"(c) ADOPTATION OF PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall adopt the negotiated rulemaking procedures to the unique context of self-governance and the government-to-government relationship between the United States and Indian Tribes.

"(d) EFFECT.—The Secretary may repeal any regulation that is inconsistent with this Act.

"(2) the consistency of the decision with the requirements and policies of this title.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—
S. 294
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “Native American Business Incubators Program Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.
Congress finds that—

(1) entrepreneurs face specific challenges when transforming ideas into profitable business enterprises;

(2) entrepreneurs that want to provide products and services in reservation communities face an additional set of challenges that require specialized knowledge;

(3) a business incubator is an organization that assists entrepreneurs in navigating obstacles that prevent innovative ideas from becoming viable businesses by providing services that include—

(A) workspace and facilities resources;

(B) access to capital, business education, and counseling;

(C) networking opportunities;

(D) mentorship opportunities; and

(E) an environment intended to help establish and expand operations;

(4) the business incubator model is suited to accelerating entrepreneurship in reservation communities because the business incubator model promotes collaboration to address shared challenges and provides individually tailored services for the purpose of overcoming obstacles unique to each participating business; and

(5) business incubators will stimulate economic development by providing Native entrepreneurs with the tools necessary to grow businesses that offer products and services to reservation communities.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.
In this Act:

(1) BUSINESS INCUBATOR.—The term “business incubator” means an organization that—

(A) provides physical workspace and facilities resources to startups and established businesses; and

(B) is designed to accelerate the growth and success of businesses through a variety of business support resources and services, including—

(i) access to capital, business education, and counseling;

(ii) networking opportunities; and

(iii) mentorship opportunities; and

(iv) other services intended to aid in developing a business.

(2) ELIGIBLE APPLICANT.—The term “eligible applicant” means an applicant eligible to apply for a grant under section 4(b).

(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term “Indian” in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(4) NATIVE AMERICAN.—The terms “Native American” and “Native” have the meaning given the term “Indian” in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(5) NATIVE AMERICAN; NATIVE.—The terms “Native American” and “Native” have the meaning given the term “Indian” in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(6) NATIVE ENTREPRENEUR.—The term “Native entrepreneur” means an entrepreneur who is a Native American.

(7) PROGRAM.—The term “program” means the program established by this Act.


(9) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(10) TRIBAL COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.—The term “tribal college or university” has the meaning given the term “Tribal College or University” in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1029(b)).

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.
(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program in the Office of Indian Economic Development to which the act providing for the establishment of the Indian Self Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5301) applies under which the Secretary shall provide financial assistance in the form of competitive grants to eligible applicants for the establishment and operation of business incubators that serve reservation communities by providing business incubation and other business services to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs.

(b) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under the program, an applicant shall—

(i) be—

(A) a tribal tribe;

(B) a tribal college or university;

(C) an institution of higher education; or

(D) a private nonprofit organization or tribal nonprofit organization;

(ii) provides business and financial technical assistance; and

(iii) will commit to serving 1 or more reservation communities;

(2) JOINT PROJECT.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Two or more entities may submit a joint application for a program that combines the resources and expertise of those entities at a physical location dedicated to assisting Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs under the program.

(B) CONTENTS.—A joint application submitted under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) contain a certification that each participant of the joint project is one of the eligible entities described in paragraphs (1)(A); and

(ii) demonstrate that together the participants meet the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) and subclause (II) of clause (i) of paragraph (2).

(3) JOINT SELECTION PROCESS.—(A) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Each eligible applicant desiring a grant under the program shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including—

(i) a certification that the applicant—

(I) is an eligible applicant;

(II) will designate an executive director or program manager, if such director or manager has not been designated, to manage the business incubator; and

(III) agrees—

(I) to a site evaluation by the Secretary as part of the final selection process; and

(II) to an annual programmatic and financial examination for the duration of the grant; and

(B) CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, remedys any problems identified pursuant to the site evaluation under clause (I) or an examination under clause (II), the final selection process, and the programmatic and financial examination described in clause (I) and (II) of subparagraph (A).
(C) a 3-year plan that describes—
(i) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs to be participating in the business incubator;
(ii) the role of the business incubator will focus on a particular type of business or industry;
(iii) a detailed breakdown of the services to be offered to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in the business incubator; and
(iv) a detailed breakdown of the services, if any, not offered to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs not participating in the business incubator;
(D) a demonstration, including evidence, that the eligible applicant will provide—
(i) conducting financial, management, and marketing assistance programs designed to educate or improve the business skills of current or prospective businesses;
(ii) working in and providing services to Native American communities;
(iii) providing assistance to entities conducting business in reservation communities;
(iv) providing technical assistance under Federal business and entrepreneurial development programs for which Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs are eligible; and
(v) managing finances and staff effectively; and
(E) a site description of the location at which the eligible applicant will provide physical workspace, including a description of the technologies, equipment, and other resources that will be available to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in the business incubator.

(2) EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating each application, the Secretary shall consider—
(i) the ability of the eligible applicant—
(A) to operate a business incubator that effectively imparts entrepreneurial business and management skills to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs, as demonstrated by the experience and qualifications of the eligible applicant;
(B) to commence providing services within a minimum period of time, as determined by the Secretary; and
(C) to provide quality incubation services to a significant number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;
(ii) the eligible applicant in providing services in Native American communities, including in the 1 or more reservation communities described in the application;
(iii) the proposed location of the business incubator;
(B) PRIORITY.—
(i) a site proposal, the Secretary shall conduct a site visit or video conference of the site to ensure the site is consistent with the written site proposal;
(ii) a timeline describing when the eligible applicant will be—
(A) in possession of the proposed site; and
(B) operating the business incubator at the proposed site;
(C) FOLLOWUP.—Not later than 1 year after awarding a grant application and before any disbursement is made, the Secretary shall ensure the eligible applicant is compliant with the purposes of the program.
(D) ADMINISTRATION.—
(I) DURATION.—Each grant awarded under the program shall be for a term of 3 years.

(1) ANNUAL EVALUATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after awarding a grant application and before any disbursement is made, the Secretary shall—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall disburse grant funds awarded to an eligible applicant in annual installments.
(B) Waiver.—The Secretary may—
(i) operate a business incubator at the proposed site;
(ii) a timeline describing when the eligible applicant will be—
(A) in possession of the proposed site; and
(B) operating the business incubator at the proposed site;
(C) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INITIAL ASSISTANCE.—
(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an eligible applicant that receives a grant under the program shall be required to provide non-Federal contributions in an amount equal to not less than 25 percent of the total amount of the grant.

(1) PAYMENT.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an eligible applicant that receives a grant under the program shall—
(iii) managing finances and staff effectively; and
(B) PAYMENT.—On request by the eligible applicant, the Secretary may make disbursements of grant funds more frequently than annually, on the condition that disbursements shall be made not more frequently than quarterly.
(C) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INITIAL ASSISTANCE.—
(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an eligible applicant that receives a grant under the program shall be required to provide non-Federal contributions in an amount equal to not less than 25 percent of the total amount of the grant.

(2) PAYMENT.—On request by the eligible applicant, the Secretary may make disbursements of grant funds more frequently than annually, on the condition that disbursements shall be made not more frequently than quarterly.

(3) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INITIAL ASSISTANCE.—
(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an eligible applicant that receives a grant under the program shall—

(A) to provide culturally tailored incubation services to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;
(B) use a competitive process for selecting Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs to participate in the business incubator;
(C) provide physical workspace and facilities that permits Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs to conduct business and collaborate with other Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;
(D) provide entrepreneurship and business skills training and education to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs including—
(i) technical assistance to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;
(ii) marketing education, including training and counseling in—
(I) identifying and segmenting domestic and international markets;
(ii) preparing and executing marketing plans;
(iii) locating contract opportunities;
(iv) negotiating contracts; and
(v) using varying public relations and advertising techniques;
(E) provide direct mentorship or assistance for mentoring programs in the sector in which the Native business or Native entrepreneur operates or intends to operate; and
(F) provide access to networks of potential investors, professionals in the same or similar fields, and other business owners with similar businesses.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining whether to renew a grant award, the Secretary shall consider whether the eligible applicant—
(i) the results of the annual evaluations of the eligible applicant under subsection (f)(1);
(ii) the performance of the business incubator operated by the applicant, as compared to the performance of other business incubators receiving assistance under the program;
(iii) whether the eligible applicant continues to be an eligible applicant under the program, and
(iv) the evaluation considerations for initial awards under subsection (c)(2).

(2) DURATIONS.—Each grant awarded under the program shall be for a term of 3 years.

(2) PAYMENT.—On request by the eligible applicant, the Secretary may make disbursements of grant funds more frequently than annually, on the condition that disbursements shall be made not more frequently than quarterly.

(3) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INITIAL ASSISTANCE.—
(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an eligible applicant that receives a grant under the program shall—

(A) to provide culturally tailored incubation services to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;
(B) use a competitive process for selecting Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs to participate in the business incubator;
(C) provide physical workspace and facilities that permits Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs to conduct business and collaborate with other Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;
(D) provide entrepreneurship and business skills training and education to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs including—
(i) financial education, including training and counseling in—
(I) identifying and segmenting domestic and international markets;
(ii) preparing and executing marketing plans;
(iii) locating contract opportunities;
(iv) negotiating contracts; and
(v) using varying public relations and advertising techniques;
(E) provide direct mentorship or assistance for mentoring programs in the sector in which the Native business or Native entrepreneur operates or intends to operate; and
(F) provide access to networks of potential investors, professionals in the same or similar fields, and other business owners with similar businesses.

(3) TECHNOLOGY.—Each eligible applicant shall leverage technology to the maximum extent practicable to provide Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs with access to the connectivity tools needed to compete against 21st-century market.
conduct an evaluation of, and prepare a report on, the eligible applicant, which shall—
(A) describe the performance of the eligible applicant; and
(B) include in determining the ongoing eligibility of the eligible applicant.
(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary awards a grant to an eligible applicant under the program, and annually thereafter for the duration of the grant, each eligible applicant receiving funds under the program shall submit to the Secretary a report describing the services the eligible applicant provided under the program during the preceding year.
(B) REPORT CONTENT.—The report described in subparagraph (A) shall include—
(i) a detailed breakdown of the Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs receiving services from the business incubator, including, for the year covered by the report—
(I) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in or receiving services from the business incubator and the types of services provided to those Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;
(II) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs established and jobs created or maintained; and
(III) the performance of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs while participating in the business incubator program and after graduation or departure from the business incubator; and
(ii) any other information the Secretary may require to evaluate the performance of a business incubator to ensure appropriate implementation of the program.
(C) TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT PRACTICABLE.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall not require an eligible applicant to report under subparagraph (A) information provided to the Secretary by the eligible applicant under other programs.
(D) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the heads of other Federal agencies to ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, the report content and form under subparagraphs (A) and (B) are consistent with other reporting requirements for Federal programs that provide business and entrepreneurial assistance.
(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the Secretary first awards funding under the program, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the performance and effectiveness of the program.
(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall—
(i) account for each program year; and
(ii) include with respect to each business incubator receiving grant funds under the program—
(I) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs that received business incubation services;
(II) the number of businesses established with the assistance of the business incubator;
(III) the number of jobs established or maintained by Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs receiving business incubation services, including a description of where the jobs are located with respect to reservation communities;
(IV) to the maximum extent practicable, the amount of capital investment and loan financing from Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs receiving business incubation services; and
(V) an evaluation of the overall performance of the business incubator.
SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.
Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to implement the program.
SEC. 6. SCHOOLS TO BUSINESS INCUBATOR PIPELINE.
The Secretary shall facilitate the establishment of relationships between eligible applicants receiving funds through the program and educational institutions serving Native American communities, including tribal colleges and universities.
SEC. 7. AGENCY PARTNERSHIPS.
The Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that business incubators receiving grant funds under the program have the information and materials needed to provide Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs with the information and assistance necessary to apply for business and entrepreneurial development programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Treasury, and the Small Business Administration.
SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.
The amounts authorized are to be appropriated to carry out the program $5,000,000 for each fiscal years 2020 through 2024.
S. 257
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the "Tribal HUD–VASH Act of 2012."
SEC. 2. RENTAL ASSISTANCE FOR HOMELESS OR AT-RISK INDIAN VETERANS.
Section 809(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)) is amended by adding at the end the following:
'(I) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph:
''(IV) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term 'eligible Indian veteran' means an Indian veteran who is—
''(AA) homeless or at risk of homelessness; and
''(bb) living—
''(AA) on or near a reservation; or
''(BB) in or near any other Indian area.
''(AA) SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.—The term "Secretary" means—
''(AA) SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.—The term 'Secretary' shall include with respect to each business incubator program, to be known as the 'Tribal HUD–VASH program', in conjunction with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, by awarding grants for the benefit of eligible Indian veterans.
''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall model the Program on the rental assistance and supported housing program authorized under subparagraph (A) and applicable appropriations Acts, including in close connection with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.
''(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—
''(aa) SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.—After consultation with Indian tribes, eligible recipients, and any other appropriate tribal organizations, the Secretary may make necessary and appropriate modifications to facilitate the use of the Program by eligible recipients to serve eligible Indian veterans.
''(bb) SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—After consultation with Indian tribes, eligible recipients, and any other appropriate tribal organizations, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may make necessary and appropriate modifications to facilitate the use of the Program by eligible recipients to serve eligible Indian veterans.
'(v) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary shall model the Program on the rental assistance and supported administrative costs under the Program in the form of grants to eligible recipients.
''(v) FUNDING CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall award grants under the Program based on—
''(I) need;
''(II) administrative capacity; and
''(III) any other funding criteria established by the Secretary in a notice published in the Federal Register after consulting with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.
''(AA) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The grants awarded under the Program shall be administered in accordance with the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.), except that recipients shall—
''(i) submit to the Secretary, in a manner prescribed by the Secretary, reports on the utilization of rental assistance provided under the Program; and
''(ii) provide to the Secretary information specified by the Secretary to assess the effectiveness of the Program in serving eligible Indian veterans.
''(BB) LIMITATIONS.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall consult with eligible recipients and any other appropriate tribal organizations and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on the design of the Program to ensure the effective delivery of rental assistance and supportive services to eligible Indian veterans under the Program.
''(AA) INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.—The Director of the Indian Health Service shall provide any assistance requested by the Secretary or the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in carrying out the Program.
''(BB) INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.—The Director of the Indian Health Service shall provide any assistance requested by the Secretary or the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in carrying out the Program.
''(BB) DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.—The term "Department of Education" means the Department of Education, as such term is defined by section 4 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).
''(AA) BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.—The term "Bureau of Indian Affairs" means the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as such term is defined by section 301 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 4501).
''(BB) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term 'eligible recipient' means a recipient eligible to receive a grant under section 101 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4111).
''(II) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term 'eligible recipient' means a recipient eligible to receive a grant under section 101 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4111).
''(AA) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph:
''(AA) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term 'eligible recipient' means a recipient eligible to receive a grant under section 101 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4111).
''(CC) DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.—The term 'Department of Education' means the Department of Education, as such term is defined by section 4 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).
''(DD) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term 'eligible recipient' means a recipient eligible to receive a grant under section 101 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4111).
''(EE) BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.—The term 'Bureau of Indian Affairs' means the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as such term is defined by section 301 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 4501).
''(BB) MODEL.—The term 'model' means with respect to an Indian tribe, a model the Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in carrying out the Program, and any other assistance provided under the Program to eligible Indian veterans.
''(BB) WAIVER.—
''(AA) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (II), the Secretary may waive or specify alternative requirements for any provision of law (including regulations) that the Secretary administers in connection with the use of rental assistance made available under the Program if the Secretary finds that the waiver or alternative requirement is necessary for the effective delivery and administration of rental assistance made available under the Program to eligible Indian veterans.
''(BB) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may not waive or specify alternative requirements for any provision of law (including regulations) relating to labor standards or the environment.
“(ix) RENEWAL GRANTS.—The Secretary may—

“(I) set aside, from amounts made available for tenant-based rental assistance under this Act (other than amounts used for new grants under clause (ii)), such amounts as may be necessary to award renewal grants to eligible recipients that previously received grants under the Program in a previous year; and

“(II) specify criteria that an eligible recipient must satisfy to receive a renewal grant under this Act, including providing data on how the eligible recipient used the amounts of any grant previously received under the Program.

“(a) REPORTING.—(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Tribal HUD-VASH Act of 2019, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Director of the Indian Health Service, shall—

“(aa) conduct a review of the implementation of the Program, including any factors that may have limited its success; and

“(bb) submit a report describing the results of item (aa) to—

“(AA) the Committee on Indian Affairs, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(BB) the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs of the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

“(II) ANALYSIS OF HOUSING STOCK LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall include in the initial report submitted under subclause (I) a description of—

“(aa) any regulations governing the use of formula current assisted stock (as defined in section 1000.314 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)) within the Program;

“(bb) the number of recipients of grants under the Program that have reported the regulations described in item (aa) as a barrier to implementation of the Program; and

“(cc) proposed alternative legislation or regulations developed by the Secretary in consultation with recipients of grants under the Program to allow the use of formula current assisted stock within the Program.”

S. 216

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Spokane Tribal Reserve Equitable Compensation Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS. Congress finds that—

(1) from 1927 to 1931, at the direction of Congress, the Corps of Engineers investigated the Columbia River and its tributaries to determine sites at which power could be generated at a reasonable cost.

(2) under section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 803(e)), when licenses are issued involving tribal land within an Indian reservation, a reasonable annual charge shall be fixed for the use of the land, subject to the approval of the Indian tribe having jurisdiction over the land;

(3) in 1930, the Columbia Basin Commission, an agency of the State of Washington, received a preliminary permit from the Federal Power Commission for water power on the Grand Coulee site; and

(4) had the Columbia Basin Commission or a private entity developed the site, the Spokane Tribe would have been entitled to a reasonable annual charge for the use of the land of the Spokane Tribe;

(5) in the mid-1930s, the Federal Government determined that licensing the Spokane Tribe was infeasible under the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792 et seq.)

(A) federalized the Grand Coulee Dam project; and

(B) began construction of the Grand Coulee Dam;

(6) when the Grand Coulee Dam project was federalized, the Federal Government recognized that—

(A) development of the project affected the interests of the Spokane Tribe and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation; and

(B) it would be appropriate for the Spokane and Colville Tribes to receive a share of revenue from the disposition of power produced at Grand Coulee Dam;

(7) in the Act of June 29, 1940 (16 U.S.C. 835d et seq.), Congress—

(A) granted to the United States—

(i) in aid of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Columbia Basin Project, all lands, water, and integers of the Spokane Tribe and Colville Tribes in and to the tribal and allotted land within the Spokane and Colville Reservations, as designated by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time; and

(ii) other interests in that land as required and designated by the Secretary for certain construction undertaken in connection with the project; and

(B) provided that compensation for the land and other interests was to be determined by the Secretary in such amounts as the Secretary determined to be just and equitable;

(8) pursuant to that Act, the Secretary paid—

(A) to the Spokane Tribe, $4,700; and

(B) to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, $63,000;

(9) in 1994, following litigation under the Act of August 13, 1946 (commonly known as the “Indian Claims Commission Act” (60 Stat. 1049, chapter 959; former 25 U.S.C. 70 et seq.)), Congress ratified the Colville Settlement Agreement, which required—

(A) for past use of the land of the Colville Tribes, a payment of $3,250,000; and

(B) for continued use of the land of the Colville Tribes, annual payments of $15,250,000, adjusted annually based on revenue from the sale of electric power from the Grand Coulee Dam project and transmission of that power by the Bonneville Power Administration;

(10) the Spokane Tribe, having suffered harm similar to that suffered by the Colville Tribes, did not file a claim within the 5-year statute of limitations under the Indian Claims Commission Act;

(11) neither the Colville Tribes nor the Spokane Tribe filed claims for compensation for use of the land of the respective tribe with the Commission prior to August 13, 1951, but both tribes filed unrelated land claims prior to August 13, 1951;

(12) in 1976, over objections by the United States, the Colville Tribes were successful in amending the 1951 Claims Commission land claims to add the Grand Coulee claim of the Colville Tribe; and

(13) the Spokane Tribe had no such claim to amend, having settled the Claims Commission land claims of the Spokane Tribe with the United States in 1977;

(14) the Spokane Tribe has suffered significant harm from the construction and operation of Grand Coulee Dam;

(15) Spokane Business Council in the United States for the construction of Grand Coulee Dam equaled approximately 39 percent of Colville tribal acreage taken for construction of the dam;

(16) the payments and delegation made pursuant to this Act constitute fair and equitable compensation for the past and continued use of Spokane tribal land for the production of hydropower at Grand Coulee Dam; and

(17) by vote of the Spokane tribal membership, the Spokane Tribe has resolved that the payments and delegation made pursuant to this Act constitute fair and equitable compensation for the past and continued use of Spokane tribal land for the production of hydropower at Grand Coulee Dam.

SEC. 3. PURPOSE. The purpose of this Act is to provide fair and equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe for the use of the land of the Spokane Tribe for the generation of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS. In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Bon­neville Power Administration or the head of any successor agency, corporation, or entity that markets power produced at Grand Cou­lee Dam.

(2) COLVILLE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term “Colville Settlement Agreement” means the Settlement Agreement entered into between the National Indian Federated Tribes and the Colville Tribes, signed by the United States on April 21, 1994, and by the Colville Tribes on April 15, 1994, to settle the claims of the Colville Tribes in Docket 181-D of the Indian Claims Commission, which docket was transferred to the United States Court of Federal Claims.

(3) COLVILLE TRIBES.—The term “Colville Tribes” means the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

(4) COMPUTED ANNUAL PAYMENT.—The term “Computed Annual Payment” means the payment calculated under paragraph 2.b. of the Colville Settlement Agreement, without regard to any increase or decrease in the payment under section 2.d. of the agreement.


(6) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(7) SPOKANE BUSINESS COUNCIL.—The term “Spokane Business Council” means the governing body of the Spokane Tribe under the constitution of the Spokane Tribe.

(8) SPOKANE TRIBE.—The term “Spokane Tribe” means the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation, Washington.

SEC. 5. PAYMENTS BY ADMINISTRATOR. (a) INITIAL PAYMENT.—On March 1, 2022, the Administrator shall pay to the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 25 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for fiscal year 2023.

(b) SUBSEQUENT PAYMENTS.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2023, and March 1 of each year thereafter through March 1, 2029, the Administrator shall pay to the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 25 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for the preceding fiscal year.

(2) MARCH 1, 2030, AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—Not later than March 1, 2030, and March 1 of each year thereafter, the Administrator shall pay to the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 25 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for the preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 6. TREATMENT AFTER AMOUNTS ARE PAID. (a) USE OF PAYMENTS.—Payments made to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5 may be used or invested by the Spokane Business Council in
the same manner and for the same purposes as other Spokane Tribe governmental amounts.

(b) No Trust Responsibility of the Secretary.—The Secretary for the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5.

(c) Treatment of Funds for Certain Purposes.—Payments of all amounts to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5, and the interest and income generated by those amounts, shall be treated in the same manner as payments made under section 6 of the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan Distribution of Judgment Funds Act (100 Stat. 677).

(d) Pro Rata to All Other Amounts.—The Administrator shall have any trust responsibility for the investment, supervision, administration, or expenditure of any amounts after the date on which the funds are paid to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5.

SEC. 2. REPEAL.

(a) Public Law 89-224 (commonly known as the "Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Repeal Act") (79 Stat. 897) is repealed.

(b) DISBURSEMENT OF REMAINING FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any provision of Public Law 89-224 (79 Stat. 897) effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) relating to the distribution or use of funds, as such, derived from the receipt of any amounts under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 5 of the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-525), the excess shall disburse to the Klamath Tribe for the balance of any funds that, on or before the date of enactment of this Act, were appropriated or deposited into the trust accounts for remaining legal fees and administration and per capita trust accounts, as identified by the Secretary of the Interior, under that Act (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act).

S. 199

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

SEC. 2. LEECH LAKE BAND OF OJIBWE RESERVATION RESTORATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal land described in subsection (b)(1) was taken from members of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe during a period—

(A) beginning in 1948;

(B) during which, the Bureau of Indian Affairs improperly interpreted an order of the Secretary of the Interior to mean that the Department of the Interior had the authority to sell tribal allotments without the consent of a majority of the affected landowners;

and

(C) ending in 1959, when the Secretary of the Interior was—

(1) advised that sales described in subparagraph (B) were in violation of the Adequacy of Description Act, 25 U.S.C. 838(b); and

(2) ordered to cease conducting those sales;

and

(2) as a result of the Federal land described in subsection (b)(1) being taken from members of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe hold the smallest percentage of its original reservation lands of any Ojibwe tribe in Minnesota; and

(3) the applicable statute of limitations prohibits individuals from pursuing through the legislative process; and

(b) CREDITING.—

(1) in fiscal year 2030, $2,700,000; and

(2) in each subsequent fiscal year in which the Administrator makes a payment under section 5, $2,700,000.

(c) TREATMENT OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—Payments of all amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury from net proceeds (as defined in section 13 of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act (18 U.S.C. 838(b)) in any fiscal year, the amount of the deduction that under paragraph (1), the deduction is greater than the total amount of interest described in paragraph (2) and (3) each deduction made under this section affects any right or claim of the Tribe.

(d) TRIBAL AUDIT.—After the date on which Congress assembled, the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and

(1) in each subsequent fiscal year in which the Secretary makes to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

(f) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description submitted under paragraph (1)(B) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical error in the map or legal description submitted under this section.

(g) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description submitted under paragraph (1)(B) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Secretary.

(h) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) in general.—The Secretary shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, complete a plan of survey to establish the boundaries of the Federal land; and

(B) as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a map and legal description of the Federal land to—

(i) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

(i) EFFECT.—The map and legal description submitted under paragraph (1)(B) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Secretary.

(j) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) in general.—Except as otherwise expressly provided in this title, nothing in this title affects any right or claim of the Tribe, as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, to any land or interest in land.

(k) PROHIBITIONS.—

(1) EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from the Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Federal land.

(l) NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.—The Federal land shall not be eligible or used for any commercial forestry activity carried out under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(m) FORESTER MANAGEMENT.—Any commercial forestry activity carried out on the Federal land shall be managed in accordance with applicable Federal law.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS MONTH AND NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:30 p.m., recessed until Friday, June 28, 2019, at 5 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 27, 2019:

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD

ADITYA RAMEL, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for the remainder of the term expiring January 29, 2023.

TRAVIS LEBLANC, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2023.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

VERONICA DADLE, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

LANE SENATORES, of New York, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, Department of Energy.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RONDAL DOUGLAS JOHNSON, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of El Salvador.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

AMIR KATHRYN JOJIANI, of Wisconsin, to be Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for a term expiring January 19, 2021.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

David Michael, Satterfield, of Missouri, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Turkey.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CHRISTOPHER SCOLESE, of New York, to be Director of the National Reconnaissance Office.

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 12203:

To be rear admiral

BRAD ADAMS (LH) GENN F. PRICE

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 12203:

To be rear admiral

BRAD ADAMS (LH) SHAWN R. DUAR

BRAD ADAMS (LH) JOHN B. MUSTIN

BRAD ADAMS (LH) JOHN A. SCHMIEDER

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 12203:

To be rear admiral

BRAD ADAMS (LH) ALAN J. REYES

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 12203:

To be rear admiral

BRAD ADAMS (LH) TROY M. MCCLILLYAN

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES A. FLYNN

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 12203:

To be rear admiral

CAPT. MARK R. MORTZ

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CHRISTOPHER A. ARSELT

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MICHAEL C. CURRAN

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. LESLIE L. READMAN III

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KENNETH R. BLAIR-MON

CAPT. ROBERT C. NOWAKOWSK

CAPT. THOMAS S. WALL

CAPT. LARRY D. WATKINS

The following named officers for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. SCOTT K. FULLER

CAPT. MICHAEL J. STEFFEN

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 601:

To be general

GEN. JOHN W. RAYMOND

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. PAUL J. LACAMBRA

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL F. KURIS

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 601:

To be vice admiral

BRAD ADAMS RICKY L. WILLIAMSON

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PHILLIP W. YU

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 601:

To be brigadier general

COL. ARTHUR P. WUNDER

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Sections 624 and 7504:

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM GREEN JR.
To be vice admiral VICE ADM. PHILLIP G. GASKER
IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WOULD ASSUME THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant general LT GEN. ERIC M. ERLAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTIONS 12200 AND 12211:

To be major general BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL R. BERRY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED NAVY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 403:

To be major general BRIG. GEN. MICHEL M. RUSSELL, SR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTIONS 12200 AND 12211:

To be rear admiral (lower half) CAPT. HUAN T. NGUYEN

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE GARY B. BURMAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS. WILLIAM W. JONES, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR ROBERT WALLACE, OF WYOMING, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE.

PRIVATE AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD EDWARD W. FELTNEN, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 24, 2023.


AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HUMPHREY E. WELCH AND ENDING WITH KENNETH R. WINGATE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEITH A. KIMBALL AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM S. MCKINNEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON A. ABRAM AND ENDING WITH ANTHONY J. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON L. BURK AND ENDING WITH SHANNON A. WEST, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.


ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HUMPHREY E. WELCH AND ENDING WITH KENNETH R. WINGATE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.


ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON L. BURK AND ENDING WITH SHANNON A. WEST, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW A. BUCH AND ENDING WITH TROY J. SHERILL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH REBEKAH R. COOK AND ENDING WITH DENIZ M. PISKIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW M. JOHNSTON AND ENDING WITH LEONARD N. WALKER IV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN J. BOYLAN AND ENDING WITH NED L. SWANSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALBERT E. ARCKINSON AND ENDING WITH GEORGE S. ZINTAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TODD W. GRYER AND ENDING WITH ANTHONY J. SMOLA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2019.
RECOGNIZING ELLEN CRAIN OF BUTTE
HON. GREG GIANFORTE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019
Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Ellen Crain of Butte for her 29 years of service as the Director of the Butte-Silver Bow Public Archives and for transforming the public archives into a renowned source of research and community pride.

Ellen, a native of Butte, began her work as director of the archives in 1990. She immediately set out to acquire additional collections of historical documents, maps, books, and articles. Outgrowing their current location, the old Butte Fire Station No. 1, Ellen led an expansion project in 2007. Butte-Silver Bow voters overwhelmingly supported her efforts and passed a $7.5 million bond for the archives.

The project included the renovation of the historic fire department station that had been home to the archives since 1981, and an expansion of two archival vaults and a community meeting space.

Under Ellen’s leadership, the Butte-Silver Bow Public Archives has become a recognized source for research. Approximately 5,000 academic and family historians visit each year from all over the world. The community room is a busy place with bi-weekly brown bag lunches attracting large audiences and well-known speakers. Outreach efforts include workshops on preserving family archives and connecting with various ethnic populations in the community.

“Butte has had such a historic impact” said Ellen. “Much of the copper that electrified the country came from Butte. Hand-in-hand with that is the historic contributions to organized labor from a diverse ethnic population. It is such an honor for me and my staff to represent Butte. We are always uncovering new ways to look at old stories.”

Madam Speaker, for her leadership and dedication to preserving Montana’s historic impact on the country and the world, I recognize Ellen Crain for her spirit of Montana.

IN HONOR OF NATIONAL SUNGLASSES DAY
HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019
Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Sunglasses Day and the importance of eye protection in the summer and throughout the year.

Unprotected exposure to UV rays may lead to serious vision problems including short-term issues such as sensitivity to light, trouble seeing, sunburn of the eyes or eyelids, irritated eyes, and red or swollen eyes—in addition to serious long-term issues. Thankfully, this damage can be prevented. Manufacturers and suppliers in Texas and around the country that provide sunglasses with UVA/UVB protective lenses are helping to equip Americans to protect their eyes.

In the case of eye care, prevention through protection is critical. As a physician, I commend the Vision Council for its work to educate Americans on the importance of healthy vision. On National Sunglasses Day, we are reminded that everyone can take easy steps to protect our eyes.

INTERNATIONAL MOTOR SPORTS ASSOCIATION (IMSA)
HON. MICHAEL WALTZ
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019
Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, since the 1940s, Daytona Beach has been the premiere destination for auto racing.

Fifty years ago, Bill France, Sr. and John and Peggy Bishop laid a foundation that today supports one of the most prominent auto racing organizations in the world—the International Motorsports Association. What began as a sanctioning body for a Formula Ford and Formula Vee race at Pocono Raceway has grown to become an international powerhouse specializing in world-class sports car competition.

This year, IMSA, based in Daytona Beach, turns 50. It comes from humble beginnings. The IMSA started as a race with fewer than 300 attendees has expanded by leaps and bounds over the last 50 years now boasting some of the largest attendance numbers in its history.

Here in my district, we understand the excitement and the benefits of our car racing. IMSA has been an important piece of our community, debuting its Grand-Am road racing circuit in 2000 at Daytona.

This year, the IMSA will lead seven motorsports platforms and deliver live coverage to racing fans all over the world.

It’s an honor to recognize the IMSA and their contributions to our district and the racing community. I’d like to congratulate them on 50 years worth being proud of. Here’s to many more.

IN SUPPORT OF THE SHERRILL AMENDMENT NO. 191 TO H.R. 3055
HON. MIKIE SHERRILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019
Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, today I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment, and to thank the Interior and Environment Appropriations Subcommittee Chairwoman McCollum and Ranking Member Joyce for their leadership in adopting this important provision.

COMMERCES, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020
SPEECH OF
HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 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, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes:

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chair, as many of bridges across the nation are reaching the end of their useful lives, it is important for the Department to prioritize funding for the design of new structures needed to replace these out of date and outdated bridges. This is most critical for bridges that constitute essential components of evacuation routes, such as our two Cape Cod bridges. When these structures are owned by the United States Government, we have both a legal and a moral responsibility to ensure that they are adequate to the demands put upon them.

In my district, nearly 250,000 of my constituents live on the peninsula of Cape Cod and the Islands of Martha’s Vineyard and Nantucket. In the event of an emergency, these citizens’ only available evacuation route is...
over the Cape Cod Canal bridges. The Canal bridges were completed in 1935 and 1938. They were constructed for the age of the Model T, and not the age of the SUV.

The Canal bridges are now insufficient for the needs of the Cape and Islands community. The lanes on the bridges are too narrow, and do not support state and federal highway standards. They lack a breakdown lane that could be used for additional road space in an emergency. With the Canal bridges in their current state on a busy weekend, the traffic can back up for miles. During an evacuation scenario, this congestion would be far worse and pose a real risk to public safety.

The Cape Cod Canal bridges have reached the end of their useful lives, and modern replacements for them will be needed within the next several years. Replacement bridges must be designed soon so that the United States Government can live up to its responsibility to provide transit for Cape Cod residents and visitors over the Cape Cod Canal—especially in the event of an emergency.

The Canal bridges, and projects like them across the nation, need funding to support them through the costly design phase. Without designs in hand, it is impossible for transportation planners to precisely estimate the scope of work and costs of replacing this aging infrastructure so they can move forward towards construction. By my amendment, this is so important not only for our community, but communities like ours around the country.

HONORING JOHN JOSEPH MANFREDA
HON. MIKE THOMPSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember John Joseph Manfreda for his lifelong belief in and staunch commitment to exceptional public service.

Born in Washington, DC, Mr. Manfreda received his undergraduate degree in business finance and economics from the University of Maryland. He earned his law degree from the American University School of Law in 1970 and earned a master’s degree in tax law from Georgetown University Law Center in 1974. Mr. Manfreda began his almost 50-year career in public service at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF) Counsel Office and its Internal Revenue Service predecessor.

From 1999 to 2003, he served as Chief Counsel for ATF. Mr. Manfreda was integral to the founding of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB). He served TTB as the Deputy Administrator before being appointed to the Administrator of the Bureau in 2005.

Mr. Manfreda was widely respected for his knowledge, fairness, and honesty by his colleagues and those he worked with in the industry he regulated. He helped write many alcohol laws when he served as Counsel for ATF and retained the information about those laws. He was a fair man and was always willing to listen. Mr. Manfreda was an honorable man, a character who valued honesty and demonstrated that value. Mr. Manfreda was recognized for his important work with the Meritorious and Distinguished Presidential Rank Awards and the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms.

Madam Speaker, John Joseph Manfreda was a dedicated public servant who held the sincere belief in the good of public service. He inspired his coworkers and was a friend and mentor to those who knew him and his devoted family man to his wife, children, and grandchildren. It is therefore fitting and proper that we remember the life and honor the service of John Joseph Manfreda here today.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE USCGC ‘MACKINAW’ IN CHEBOYGAN, MICHIGAN
HON. JACK BERGMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize today the 75th anniversary of the United States Coast Guard Cutter Mackinaw, based out of Cheboygan, Michigan.

The original Icebreaker Mackinaw (WAGB-83) was constructed during World War II to facilitate winter shipping over the Great Lakes and maintain year-round war-time production of steel. Cheboygan served as her home port as she played this critical role. After more than 62 years of outstanding service facilitating commerce in support of the economy and security of the entire nation, the original Mackinaw was decommissioned in 2006 and replaced with the USCGC Mackinaw (WLBB-30).

Performing the same critical icebreaking role as her namesake, the Mackinaw also serves year-round as an Aids to Navigation ship and conducts law enforcement, search and rescue, and environmental emergency response missions. Its unique design makes it exceptionally maneuverable and capable of breaking smooth ice up to 42 inches thick. Since the first ship was launched 75 years ago, the impact of the Mackinaw on the economy and security of Michigan and the entire country cannot be overstated.

The anniversary celebration for the Mackinaw will take place as a part of the 8th Annual Michigan Waterways festival, a 4-day community celebration of the Michigan Inland Waterway and Northern Michigan, running from June 27th to the 30th.

Madam Speaker, the celebration of the 8th Annual Waterways Festival is the perfect opportunity for us to appreciate the history and service of the USCGC Mackinaw and her crew. Michiganders can take immense pride in knowing that the First District is home to such an important vessel. On behalf of my constituents, I wish the Mackinaw, her crew, and the city of Cheboygan all the best in their future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. JACKIE WALORSKI
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday June 26, 2019, I wasn’t able to vote due to a family emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 415; NAY on Roll Call No. 416; YEA on Roll Call No. 417; YEA on Roll Call No. 418; and YEA on Roll Call No. 419.

COMMANDER JAMES B. MILLS
HON. KEVIN HERN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, this week, I welcomed to my office a family of constituents in town to celebrate the life and legacy of a fallen war hero at Arlington National Cemetery.

The Geiger family traveled here to honor the life of their relative Commander James B. Mills, who died more than 50 years ago while serving in the Navy.

Commander Mills’ plane disappeared from radar just past midnight on September 21, 1966. No distress call was heard, no one saw the plane go down, and extensive aerial searches yielded no clues as to what happened to Commander Mills and his copilot James Bauder.

For more than 50 years, Commander Mills’ family had no closure on his loss, until about a year ago when his remains were found off the coast of Vietnam.

This week, Commander Mills was honored with a burial at the Arlington National Cemetery attended by more than 300 people who came to celebrate his life and finally put Commander Mills to rest in his home country as the hero he is. Commander Mills and his loved ones have found peace at last.

CARIBBEAN AMERICAN HERITAGE
HON. STACEY E. PLASKETT
OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, as Americans begin many of the pastimes of summer that are quintessentially American—baseball, backyard barbeques, family road trips—Caribbean Americans spend the month of June reflecting on their contributions and melded cultures in the United States.

Congress adopted H. Con. Res. 71 which established the Caribbean American Heritage month, sponsored by Congresswoman Barbara Lee and signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2006. “Whereas people of Caribbean heritage are found in every State of the Union...” is the first line of the U.S. House of Representatives’ resolution to establish a Caribbean American Heritage month. While the Act establishing Caribbean American Heritage month emphasized the present presence of Caribbean Americans, American history would not be complete without the integration and support of Caribbean people. From America’s founding to the present, Caribbean people have supported and assisted in the articulation of the nation’s rightful place in the world, its traditions, its language and cultural style.

Despite being ostracized and alienated by many of his contemporaries for his Caribbean
roots—but for Alexander Hamilton’s contribution to our military, creation of our banking system and assistance in drafting the Constitution—our country would not be as strong today as it is. From American Revolution Haitian gens de couleur libre (free men of color) fighting troops to the revolt leader Denmark Vessey to Gen. Powell’s tobacco and awe doctrine, the Caribbean emphasis on revolutionary and righteous principles enforced through martial force.

The Caribbean is a melting pot of different races, cultures, ethnicities, and languages; it is the southern reflection of the American experience. Caribbean Americans like all who come to this country desire to make themselves and this country better.

**DEPUTY SHERIFF MATTHEW MORENO**

**HON. KEN BUCK**
**OF COLORADO**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the dedication and sacrifice of a fallen Deputy Sheriff, Matthew Moreno.

A resident of Trinidad, Colorado, Matthew proudly served his community as a full-time Deputy Sheriff in Las Animas County. He also worked part-time as an Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) for the Trinidad Ambulance District. In Matthew’s free time, he volunteered as a firefighter—quickly rising to the rank of Fire Captain.

On December 12, 2018, Matthew was struck by an impaired driver while responding to a domestic disturbance call. Tragically, he did not survive the accident.

Our nation owes a debt of gratitude to our police, fire fighters, and first responders, especially our fallen heroes. Matthew’s commitment to serving others exceeded expectations, and his willingness to put his life on the line to protect others will never be forgotten. On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my deepest gratitude for Matthew’s service and deepest condolences to his family, friends, and the entire community that undoubtedly feels his loss.

Madam Speaker, it is an honor to recognize the life of Deputy Sheriff Matthew Moreno for his commitment to family, community, and the United States of America.

**RECOGNIZING THE CUMBERLAND CONTAINER CORPORATION’S 50TH ANNIVERSARY**

**HON. JOHN W. ROSE**
**OF TENNESSEE**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Cumberland Container Corporation in honor of its 50th anniversary.

A time-honored mainstay of Putnam County, Cumberland Container Corporation was granted its corporate charter by the State of Tennessee on October 21, 1968. Nine months later, this company planted its roots in a 6,000-square-foot building in Monterey, Tennessee. At its commencement, this company served the area by providing manufacturing containers and packaging materials to local businesses with nothing more than four pieces of used equipment and six employees.

Cumberland Container Corporation was dedicated to its belief in efficiently supplying local companies. Although times proved to be tough at the beginning, this company persevered and demonstrated the brilliance of this concept through consistent customer growth over the last five decades.

Fast forward to this year, Cumberland Container Corporation is currently operating in a 290,000-square-foot building on over 18 acres of land. By current count, Cumberland Container Corporation now employs 85 associates and owns a vast assortment of machinery for its production and logistical needs.

To my House colleagues here today, I hope that you will join me in recognizing the Cumberland Container Corporation for their long-standing service to the community. It is the hardworking nature of this company and its employees that truly make exactly what it means to be a Tennessean.

**CELEBRATING THE CAREER OF DR. EDWARD J. LUKOMSKI AT PATHWAYS, INC.**

**HON. TOM REED**
**OF NEW YORK**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the service of Dr. Edward J. Lukomski to Pathways, Inc. and congratulate him on his retirement.

For the last sixteen years, Dr. Ed Lukomski has served as the President and Chief Executive Officer of Pathways, Inc. which provides services to two thousand people in fifteen counties. Pathways, Inc. is a not-for-profit human service organization offering in-home, community, and foster care services to youth with serious emotional disturbances, intellectual and developmental disabilities, and chronic medical conditions. Under Ed’s leadership, Pathways has grown exponentially, not only in services and programs offered, but also geographically in their area of service coverage.

Ed’s dedication and hard work has ensured the expansion of opportunities for youths in need of aid, and for that we must commend him.

To recognize his outstanding service, Pathways will be dedicating their Broad Street facility in Horseheads, New York, in his honor. The newly renamed “Lukomski Center” will stand as a fitting tribute to Ed’s legacy as Pathways continues his work to expand services to youths in need.

As Ed moves forward with the next chapter of his life, we applaud his tireless efforts to help youth in our community and we wish him all the best in his retirement.

Given the above, I ask that this Legislative Body pause in its deliberations and join me to celebrate Ed Lukomski and his extraordinary career.

**RECOGNIZING THE CUMBERLAND CONTAINER CORPORATION’S 50TH ANNIVERSARY**

**HON. JOHN W. ROSE**
**OF TENNESSEE**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Cumberland Container Corporation in honor of its 50th anniversary.

A time-honored mainstay of Putnam County, Cumberland Container Corporation was granted its corporate charter by the State of Tennessee on October 21, 1968. Nine months later, this company planted its roots in a 6,000-square-foot building in Monterey, Tennessee. At its commencement, this company served the area by providing manufacturing containers and packaging materials to local businesses with nothing more than four pieces of used equipment and six employees.

Cumberland Container Corporation was dedicated to its belief in efficiently supplying local companies. Although times proved to be tough at the beginning, this company persevered and demonstrated the brilliance of this concept through consistent customer growth over the last five decades.

Fast forward to this year, Cumberland Container Corporation is currently operating in a 290,000-square-foot building on over 18 acres of land. By current count, Cumberland Container Corporation now employs 85 associates and owns a vast assortment of machinery for its production and logistical needs.

To my House colleagues here today, I hope that you will join me in recognizing the Cumberland Container Corporation for their long-standing service to the community. It is the hardworking nature of this company and its employees that truly make exactly what it means to be a Tennessean.

**CELEBRATING THE CAREER OF DR. EDWARD J. LUKOMSKI AT PATHWAYS, INC.**

**HON. TOM REED**
**OF NEW YORK**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the service of Dr. Edward J. Lukomski to Pathways, Inc. and congratulate him on his retirement.

For the last sixteen years, Dr. Ed Lukomski has served as the President and Chief Executive Officer of Pathways, Inc. which provides services to two thousand people in fifteen counties. Pathways, Inc. is a not-for-profit human service organization offering in-home, community, and foster care services to youth with serious emotional disturbances, intellectual and developmental disabilities, and chronic medical conditions. Under Ed’s leadership, Pathways has grown exponentially, not only in services and programs offered, but also geographically in their area of service coverage.

Ed’s dedication and hard work has ensured the expansion of opportunities for youths in need of aid, and for that we must commend him.

To recognize his outstanding service, Pathways will be dedicating their Broad Street facility in Horseheads, New York, in his honor. The newly renamed “Lukomski Center” will stand as a fitting tribute to Ed’s legacy as Pathways continues his work to expand services to youths in need.

As Ed moves forward with the next chapter of his life, we applaud his tireless efforts to help youth in our community and we wish him all the best in his retirement.

Given the above, I ask that this Legislative Body pause in its deliberations and join me to celebrate Ed Lukomski and his extraordinary career.
to fund transitional housing and homelessness services.” Had I been present, I would have voted “NO, NO, YES, NO” on these bills, respectively.

IN HONOR OF W.S. EVERETT
HON. BRETT GUTHRIE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019
Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Wilson Spencer “W.S.” Everett of Glasgow, Kentucky. Mr. Everett was a proud patriot throughout his life, serving in the Kentucky National Guard and the United States Army during the Korean War.

For the last 30 years, Mr. Everett dedicated his time to honor the legacies of his fellow soldiers, whether through his involvement with the Glasgow chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, or his regular participation with the Chapter 20 Color Guard. Mr. Everett also designed two memorials in my district: the Hisseville Veterans Memorial and the Glasgow-Barren County Veterans Wall of Honor. His dedication to this endeavor was so great that even in his final days, Mr. Everett went to the Wall of Honor to remember the final veteran’s title.

Today, I join with Mr. Everett’s family in remembering the legacy that he left behind. He is truly an American patriot that strived to live his life in honor of each fold of the flag and I am grateful for his service not only to the country, but also to his community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MT. PLEASANT BAPTIST CHURCH
HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019
Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to rise today to celebrate Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church’s 100th Anniversary and recognize it for its numerous contributions to the greater Kansas City area. I am truly honored to have this house of worship and pillar of faith in my Congressional District.

Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church is in Kansas City’s historic 18th and Vine District, a neighborhood critical to the life and development of the African American community. In the 1920s, 18th and Vine began to grow, becoming a creative hub of African American culture and shaping the future of Kansas City for the better. Founded in 1919, Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church was crucial to this cultural renaissance. Churches throughout this period were centers of community and support. They provided members hope and encouragement in the face of seemingly hopeless challenges like inequality, discrimination, and segregation. For a century, Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church has been a vehicle for social justice and change within Kansas City’s African American community.

Today, churches continue to be a keeper of cultural tradition, a center of storytelling, and the core of African American community. As writer Shauntae Brown White wrote, “Story-telling that connects is an act of resonance that fulfills the second tenant of Afrocentric discourse, creating harmony in the midst of chaos.” For the past 100 years, the congregation of Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church has produced some of the brightest leaders, innovators, thinkers, and artists in Missouri’s Fifth Congressional District.

Today, Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church serves as a spiritual anchor within the Kansas City community. The church transforms the lives of its members for the better, unites people of all ages and supports them as they seek to live according to the teachings of Jesus Christ. For the past thirty-three years, Pastor L. Henderson Bell has led the church to be a house of hope for those facing adversity in the community. Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church not only is a center of spiritual development but a hub of service in its community, embodying James 2:17’s assertion that, “Faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead.” The church serves the poor and marginalized members of the community by reaching out to them and providing educational opportunities, Bible study classes, health and scholarship trainings, and programs for music and dance.

Mt. Pleasant Baptist has been and continues to be an advocate for the underserved and a champion of the faithful in Kansas City. Its century worth of contributions to the soul of Missouri’s Fifth Congressional District are worthy of praise and recognition. Madam Speaker, please join me in celebrating and honoring Pastor L. Henderson Bell and the congregation of Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church, both past and present, for achieving this milestone.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. JACKIE WALORSKI
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019
Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday June 26, 2019, I wasn’t able to vote due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on rollcall No. 420; Yea on rollcall No. 421; Yea on rollcall No. 422; Yea on rollcall No. 423, and Nay on rollcall No. 424.

HONORING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE SISTERS OF SAINT FRANCIS OF TIPPIN
HON. JIM JORDAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019
Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I am honored to commend to the House the outstanding work of the Sisters of Saint Francis of Tiffin, Ohio, who are marking 150 years of selfless service to others. The Tiffin Franciscans were founded by Father Joseph L. Bihn and Mrs. Elizabeth Schaefer (Sister Mary Francis) in the wake of the Civil War to care for the needs of orphans and the elderly. The work of the sisters continues to be rooted in the words of Matthew’s Gospel: “Whatever you did to one of these My brethren, you did to Me.” Throughout the years, the sisters have devoted themselves to the Franciscan values of caring for the poor and for all of God’s creation. Dedicated to spreading the message of the Gospel, they have served countless people through their evangelization, education, child care, foster care, and other vital ministries designed to meet the needs of the Tiffin community and far beyond.

Madam Speaker, the Sisters of Saint Francis are marking their sesquicentennial with events and commemorations throughout the year. On behalf of the people of Ohio’s Fourth Congressional District, I am pleased to join in the accolades to them as they celebrate this milestone. They have my best wishes and my thanks for their tireless service to others.

HONORING JAMES SCORDO FOR OVER THREE DECADES OF SERVICE TO THE NORTH COUNTRY AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CREDO COMMUNITY CENTER FOR THE TREATMENT OF ADDICTIONS
HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019
Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor James “Jim” Scordo for over three decades of service to the North Country as Executive Director of Credo Community Center for the Treatment of Addictions.

Jim Scordo has shepherded the community through good and bad times since 1988 when he helped the center recover from a devastating fire. Jim sought help from his community and graciously raised over $175,000 dollars to rebuild. When the community center opened its substance abuse outpatient clinic, he was named its first Executive Director. Since then, countless North Country residents have found help overcoming addiction and there are many families in Jefferson County and beyond that are grateful to Jim, his staff, and volunteers for their loved one’s health and wellbeing.

The hands on, local efforts of Credo Community Center and similar centers throughout the country is crucial in the broader fight against the opioid epidemic. Communities need dedicated leadership to ensure that those services remain consistently available for those who need them most. On behalf of New York’s 21st Congressional District, I want to thank Jim for his leadership and service to the North Country and wish him the best in the next chapter.

CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GRAND HOTEL’S DESIGNATION AS A NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK
HON. JACK BERGMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019
Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the Grand Hotel upon the occasion of its 30th anniversary as a National Historic Landmark. Through its extraordinary history, cultural significance, and commitment to excellence, the Grand Hotel has become an indispensable part of Michigan’s First District.
The National Historic Landmark system was created in 1935 to recognize structures that are of outstanding historical significance, icons of ideals that shaped the nation, and pristine examples of design or construction. There is no other landmark more deserving of this designation than the Grand Hotel. First opened in 1887, the hotel was created to serve as a retreat for vacationers looking to enjoy summer on Lake Huron. Over the next 132 years, the Grand Hotel would grow to become not only a beloved part of Michigan, but a prominent feature in the popular culture and premier destination for visitors from around the world. Its unique design has been widely acclaimed, and its world’s-largest 660-foot porch has been enjoyed by everyone from John F. Kennedy and Gerald Ford to Thomas Edison and Mark Twain. The National Park Service designated the hotel as a National Historic Landmark in 1989, citing its historic architecture and representation of the American dream of a “summer place.” Today, its role as a summer place remains stronger than ever for thousands of guests and residents every year.

Madam Speaker, the celebration of the Grand Hotel’s 30th anniversary as a National Historic Landmark is the perfect opportunity for us to appreciate its unique history, cultural impact, and significance to Mackinac Island, Michigan, and the United States. Michiganders can take immense pride in knowing that the First District is home to such an important landmark. On behalf of my constituents, I wish the Grand Hotel all the best in its future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE TRADITION OF THE DOOR COUNTY DAIRY BREAKFAST

HON. MIKE GALLAGHER OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tradition of the Door County Dairy Breakfast, held in Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin. The Dairy Breakfast is an iconic Door County tradition that provides the community an opportunity to learn about the significant role the dairy industry plays in Wisconsin’s economy. Community members meet dairy farmers, learn about the dairy industry, and enjoy delicious Door County coffee and pancakes.

I am grateful to the Sevastopol Future Farmers of America Alumni Association for organizing the 38th Annual Dairy Breakfast in Door County. Their work to recruit sponsors and volunteers is integral to the success of this terrific event. Throughout the year, the Sevastopol FFA Alumni Association provides educational opportunities to the community to increase awareness of Wisconsin’s dairy industry and the products produced by area dairy farmers. All proceeds from the Door County Dairy Breakfast go toward scholarships for current FFA high school seniors.

Madam Speaker, I urge all members of this body to join me in commending the efforts of the Door County Dairy Breakfast to educate the community through this time-honored tradition. Thank you to the Sevastopol FFA Alumni Association and the countless sponsors and volunteers for their continued support of Wisconsin’s dairy industry.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. STEPHEN’S COMMUNITY HOUSE
HON. JOYCE BEATTY OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 100th Anniversary of St. Stephen’s Community House. Located in the heart of my district, St. Stephen’s Community House is a sanctuary of education, development, and faith serving the Linden Community for 100 years.

Today, under the leadership of CEO, Marilyn Mehaffie; LaTisha Addo, Director of Family Services; and Kristin Giger, Director of Youth Services, St. Stephen’s provides services for residents of all ages, ranging from infant mortality initiatives and early childcare programs to vital family and senior services including sustainability efforts and eliminating food deserts.

Even after a century, St. Stephen’s Community House’s mission of dedicated service to the families of the Linden community continues to thrive, and for that the entire Third Congressional District of Ohio is forever grateful.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT HOME RULE ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment Home Rule Act. This bill would give the District of Columbia the authority to appoint all members of the D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment (Board), except when the Board is performing functions regarding an application by a foreign mission with respect to a chancery. The bill makes special exceptions, or variances, to the regulations issued by the D.C. Zoning Commission (Commission). This bill does not alter the authority of the Board.

Like every other jurisdiction in the United States, the District should be free to set its own local land-use policies. As the District continues to contend with rapid population growth and economic development, it is more important than ever that the members of the Board are accountable to District residents and local elected officials.

Under current law, in general, the Board consists of a representative each from the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) and the Commission, each of whom may be a federal official, and three mayoral appointees, subject to D.C. Council approval. The Board has no authority over federal property.

Under current law, when the Board is performing functions regarding an application by a foreign mission with respect to the location, expansion or replacement of a chancery, the Board consists of the Executive Director of NCPC; the Director of the National Park Service, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior or the Administrator of General Services, as designated by the President; and the three mayoral appointees. This bill does not change this composition. This is an important step to recognize and increase home rule for the District, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. SADIE NELSON
HON. JENNIFER WEXTON OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Sadie Pike Nelson from Virginia’s 10th Congressional District for her 70th birthday on June 24, 2019. Ms. Nelson is an active member within the 10th Congressional District which includes her accomplishments within the Frederick County School system, United Methodist Women, and Winchester Lions Club.

I commend Ms. Nelson on her lifetime pursuit of community activism. After moving to Winchester, VA in 1980, Ms. Nelson became a teacher with the special education program at the Robert E. Aylor Middle School, where she taught for 25 years. She then became the Assistant Principal for Admiral Richard E. Byrd Middle School for seven years before retiring with 32 years in education all together. Ms. Nelson was the first African American Administrator in the history of Frederick County Public Schools.

Ms. Nelson joined the John Mann United Methodist Church in 1985. She is presently the Administrative Chairman of the church council, President of the United Methodist Women, and President of the Usher Board. She has also served as the Spiritual Growth Coordinator for the Winchester District of United Methodist Women for a total of five years. Outside of the church, Ms. Nelson was the first African American to be invited to join the Winchester Lioness Club where she served as president in 2005, 2006, 2011, 2018, and 2019. Through this organization she strives to make a difference in women’s lives with philanthropies that include ownership of a two-year woman’s college and five programs that provide higher educational assistance through scholarships and loans for women to continue their education.

Ms. Nelson is also the proud mother of one daughter, proud grandmother of four granddaughters, and proud great-grandmother of a set of twin great-granddaughters and four great-grandsons.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing and applauding Ms. Sadie Pike Nelson on her accomplishments and wish her the best for her 70th birthday celebration.

RECOGNIZING STAFF SERGEANT STANLEY NANCE
HON. BEN MCADAMS OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. MCADAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Staff Sergeant Stanley Nance.
In May 1944, 1,100 U.S. military men joined ranks to form what would be called the "Ghost Army." Composed largely of artists, this unit had unusual orders: not to avoid detection by enemy forces, but to actively attract attention through an ingenious optical illusion.

One of those men, Sergeant First Class Stanley Nance, signal Company Special of the 23rd Headquarters Special Troops. The Ghost Army's tactics were to impersonate other Allied units, using inflatable tanks and jeeps made of sticks and burlap, to make the enemy believe that large factions of soldiers were on Omaha Beach and surrounding areas, after D-Day.

Massive speakers were mounted to the back of military vehicles, blasting the ambient noises of a much larger unit. They sounded like they were coming from the battlefield, but in fact had been recorded months before in Fort Knox, Kentucky.

Kept a secret until 1985, the story of the Ghost Army and those in its ranks serves as a heroic tale of young Americans' bold actions to defend freedom.

Decades later, Staff Sergeant Nance's great-granddaughter, Madeline Christianson, told his story through a history project, which recently won the World War II History Award at the National History Competition. Her project is an amazing re-creation of a story of skill, courage and triumph unique in the annals of history.

As we prepare to celebrate Independence Day 2019, we honor two extraordinary generals of history.

HONORING SPECIAL AGENT MICHAEL WILLIAMS ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. GARY J. PALMER OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Special Agent Michael Williams for his 32 years of dedicated service to Alabama as a member of the United States Secret Service. He concludes his distinguished career as the Special Agent in Charge of the U.S. Secret Service Birmingham Field Office, where he has had executive oversight over operations in Alabama and Mississippi.

Special Agent Williams is a native of Birmingham and a graduate of the University of Alabama at Birmingham. He joined the Secret Service in 1985 and over the span of his career he has been recognized for investigative excellence, including receiving the Outstanding Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award. In 1996, he was assigned to the Presidential Protective Division in Washington, D.C. where he protected President William J. Clinton and President George W. Bush. He was promoted to a Supervisor Special Agent assigned to the Protective Intelligence Division in 2001.

Special Agent Williams was able to come home in 2003, when he was promoted to Assistant Special Agent in Charge of the Birmingham Field Office.

He returned to Washington, D.C. in 2005 where he served as the Assistant Special Agent in Charge of the Presidential Protective Division. In October 2008, he was promoted to the Special Agent in Charge of the Columbia, South Carolina Field Office.

In January 2013, he once again found his way to D.C. when he was promoted into the Senior Executive Service where he served as the Special Agent in Charge of the Protective Intelligence and Assessment Division. In this capacity, he had executive oversight for protective intelligence, threat assessments and the Secret Service behavioral analysis program. In 2015, he was promoted to the position of Deputy Assistant Director in the Secret Service Office of Protective Operations. He ensured that the President, the First Lady and all protected persons, places and events received the highest level of security based on threats and vulnerabilities.

Throughout his career, Special Agent Williams has also served the community volunteering for a number of organizations, including the Big Brother program, Boys/Girls Club and Crime Stoppers of Metro Alabama. He is a member of Kappa Alpha Phi fraternity and received UAB's Outstanding Alumni Award. He is married to Angela Bryant-Williams and they have a son, Bryant Michael Williams.

I am grateful to Special Agent Williams for his 32 years of service to this country and wish him well in retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN WEEKS

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of longtime Kentuckian Mr. John Weeks and to wish him well in his retirement.

For over 40 years, John has provided legal counsel in the commonwealth of Kentucky be it to the Courier Journal daily newspaper, WHAS TV and radio, Standard Gravure, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kentucky, and—since 1992—Dental of Kentucky. In 2000, he became Vice President and General Counsel and in that capacity has been responsible for legal affairs and legal compliance including insurance regulation, HIPAA, employment law, federal requirements, and government relations for the company at both the state and federal level.

Prior to his successful legal career, John served this great county in the United States Navy submarine and intelligence branches. And continued to help other veterans—serving on the board of the Kentucky chapter of USA Cares, a veterans support organization.

I was able to work directly with John from time to time and enjoyed getting to know him and his family well. I'm sure he is looking forward to spending more time with his wife, Lynda, and their children and grandchildren. I would like to formally congratulate John on his retirement and wish him luck in this next chapter.
of Engineers Kansas City District Commander. He has diligently served in this role for three years.

After earning degrees from The U.S. Military Academy at West Point, the University of Missouri-Rolla, the National Defense University and the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Colonel Guttmersen was responsible for leading engineering battalions across the United States and around the world. In addition to these assignments, he served in combat operations in Iraq and the Republic of Korea.

As Commander of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Kansas City District, Colonel Guttmersen oversaw many military and civil works projects throughout the District. From overseeing construction projects at the region’s many military installations to ensuring our levees and dams are structurally sound, Colonel Guttmersen ably led an office with diverse mandates and responsibilities. Although his resume boasts many accomplishments, Colonel Guttmersen’s work to maintain the superior quality of the Emergency Operations Center, which plays a vital role in responding to natural disasters whenever and wherever they may occur, is most impressive.

Madam Speaker, Colonel Guttmersen is a true professional and has exhibited remarkable leadership during his time as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Kansas City District Commander. I trust my fellow members of the House will join me in wishing him well in the days to come.

### KEEP MAIL SAFE ACT

**HON. GRACE M. MENG**  
**OF NEW YORK**  
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**Thursday, June 27, 2019**

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, I rise to bring attention the growing mail theft crime in the United States that is known as mail fishing. Mail fishing is the process in which thieves “fish” mail out of blue collection boxes. Specificaly, criminals use a contraption as simple as a socket connected to a sticky substance to “fish” out envelopes from these mailboxes, then open the letters to steal people’s personal information such as bank, credit card, and Social Security numbers. Tragically, this has resulted in many incidents of identity theft and bank fraud.

In the last year alone, there were 3,000 incidents of mail fishing in New York City. These criminals also engage in check washing to re-write the name of the payee and/or the amount. Many of my constituents became victims of bank fraud, some losing thousands of dollars, as a result of having their mail fished.

That is why, in 2017, I made the push to have the United States Postal Service retrofit all standard mail collection boxes in Queens, NY. Currently, 77 percent of these mailboxes in Queens have been retrofitted. As a result, mail fishing crimes have significantly decreased in Queens. However, as only some mail collection boxes are retrofitted, mail fishing crime shifts to regions without this security feature.

Madam Speaker, it is unacceptable that our constituents cannot safely leave their mail in the United States Postal Service mail collection boxes.

This is why I am introducing the “Keep Mail Safe Act”. This bill would require the Postmaster General to conduct a study on retrofitting all standard mail collection boxes in the United States with narrow mail slots. Retrofitting all mail boxes would deter and prevent incidents of mail fishing, ensure the security of our constituents’ mail, and restore their trust in utilizing the United States Postal Service.

As mail fishing incidents are on the rise, our diligence in protecting our constituent’s mail is more important than ever. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and join me in the fight against mail fishing.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. MAC THORNBERRY**  
**OF TEXAS**  
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**Thursday, June 27, 2019**

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, June 25, 2019, I was unable to be in Washington and missed roll call votes No. 411 “King, Steve (D-IA)—Amendment No. 3—Strikes the section 126 of the underlying bill which prohibits the use of funds from the Department of the Treasury’s Forfeiture Fund to plan, design, construct or carry out a project to construct a southern Border Wall or barrier along the southern border of the U.S.” No. 412 “Norton (D-CA)—Amendment No. 4—Prohibits funds made available by this Act from being used to relocate the National Institute of Food and Agriculture or the Economic Research Service outside the National Capital Region,” No. 413 “Republican Motion to Reconsider on H. Res. 3401,” No. 414 “Amends H.R. 3401—Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019,” Had I been present, I would have voted “YES, NO, YES, NO” on these bills, respectively.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA**  
**OF ARIZONA**  
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**Thursday, June 27, 2019**

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, June 18, 2019 I inadvertently switched my recorded vote for Roll call No. 345. The vote was on Amendment No. 24 to H.R. 2740 offered by Reps. AMASH and LOFGREN. My intended vote should be noted as a “yea” on roll call 345.

### HONORING PRIDE MONTH

**HON. SYLVIA R. GARCIA**  
**OF TEXAS**  
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**Thursday, June 27, 2019**

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue that is rooted in my deeply held religious belief that we are all God’s children.

This June, in honor of Pride month, I rise not only to recognize the many contributions of the LGBTQ+ community, but also to remind my colleagues of the discrimination faced by Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer people.

House Democrats worked together last month to make history by passing the Equality Act and passed the Defense Appropriations bill with a provision to block this Administration’s attempts to discriminate against the transgender community and will continue the fight until there is true equality. I know this House will continue to fight and stand up for equality.

This Pride Month, I also want to pay special tribute to LGBTQ+ people living in fear of deportation. This Administration’s policies of fear and cruelty especially impact already vulnerable
populations. Rest assured, you have someone in Congress working to make our immigration system fair for all, including LGBTQ New Americans. Happy Pride Month.

GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

HON. JOYCE BEATTY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize June as Gun Violence Awareness Month. So far this year, nearly seven thousand Americans have been killed and almost twice as many injured at the hands of gun violence. Even more shocking, there have been 190 mass shootings across the country—in Shreveport, Philadelphia, Louisville, and Des Moines just within the last two weeks.

Gun violence is a uniquely American epidemic, but unfortunately, failure to act has also been uniquely American. Congress failed to act twenty years ago after Columbine, again twelve years ago after Virginia Tech, again after Sandy Hook, the Pulse Nightclub, Las Vegas, or Parkland. Thankfully, the new Democratic majority has passed the first gun violence prevention bills in a generation.

Whether it’s those bills or my SAFER Now Act (H.R. 282), Congress must continue our work “For the People” and act to prevent one more American from falling victim to gun violence.

HONORING AMERICA’S DAIRY FARMERS DURING NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

HON. JAMES R. BAIRD
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize our nation’s dairy farmers. Since 1937, the month of June has been set aside to celebrate National Dairy Month. The dairy industry, and the products it produces, is extremely important to the agricultural sector and hundreds of millions of Americans and consumers around the world. It generates $38 billion of direct wages for 3 million jobs on 37,000 family-owned dairy farms and related industries.

But times have been tough in recent years with narrow margins and low to no profitability. In fact, this is the fifth consecutive year that we’ve had low prices, pushing 2,700 dairy farmers out of business in 2018.

That’s why USDA’s Dairy Margin Coverage Program is so important to the American dairy industry. The Dairy Margin Coverage program will provide farmers with better coverage for lower premiums, including a retro-active start which means our dairy farmers will be able to get help with over 5 months of tough losses. As we honor the dairy producers in our communities this month, I encourage all of our Hoosier dairy farmers to sign up for their program in order to secure much needed protection during times of uncertainty. I thank them for their tireless work for the American people.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

HON. GRACE MENG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, community colleges play a critical role in American higher education. There are over 1,000 community colleges across the United States. Nearly 40 percent of full-time community college students graduate after three years and just 35 percent graduate after five years. Research also clearly shows that students who do not complete a degree are at greater risk of defaulting on their loans.

That is why, today, I am introducing the Community College Student Success Act of 2019, a bill that will help community colleges around the country by giving under-resourced colleges with high percentages of low-income and minority students the necessary funding to develop and implement comprehensive student support services.

First, the Community College Student Success Act would provide academic advising, wherein, advisors will provide ongoing, academic, and personal advising to students including helping to clearly lay out a three-year graduation plan and creating strong transfer pathways for students interested in continuing their education.

Second, this bill would provide academic and career support, wherein, students on academic probation or who have been referred to developmental courses will be required to meet weekly with a tutor. These students will also meet with an on-campus career counselor or participate in career services events at least once a semester to promote career planning and success.

Third, this bill would provide financial support, wherein, students will receive a tuition waiver to cover the gap between the tuition and fees and financial aid. Additionally, students satisfying all the meeting requirements will receive a financial incentive, such as a transportation pass or gas card, at least once per month.

Additionally, the goal of this legislation is to replicate the remarkable and proven success of the Accelerated Study in Associate Programs—ASAAP—a program that was created and instituted by the City University of New York (CUNY) in 2007. This program has been found to consistently double the graduation rates of participating students.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and join me in helping community college students across the nation by providing pathways to upward economic mobility and more opportunities. If Congress truly values the importance of educating our next generation, we must increase our investment in these institutions and the students they serve. Each person deserves a quality education—no matter their background—because education is a civil right.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MAC THORNBERY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. THORNBERY. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, June 25, 2019, I was unable to be in Washington and missed roll call votes No. 407 “Republican Motion to Recommit on H.R. 3055,” No. 408 “Passage of H.R. 3401—Com- merce, Justice, Science, Agriculture, Rural De- velopment, Food and Drug Administration, Inter- inner, Environment, Military Construction, Vet- erans Affairs, Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2020,” No. 409 “Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 462—The rule providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 3401—Emer- gency Supplemental Appropriations for Hu- manitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019,” No. 410 “Adoption of H. Res. 462—The rule providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 3401—Emer- gency Supplemental Appropriations for Hu- manitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019.” Had I been present, I would have voted “YES, NO, NO” on these bills, respectively.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF MICHAEL ERIC ENGH, S.J.

HON. ANNA G. ESCHOO
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 2019

Ms. ESCHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Michael Eric Engh, S.J., on the occasion of his retirement as President of Santa Clara University, after a decade of extraor- dinary leadership.

Father Engh was born to Marie and Donald Engh in Los Angeles on December 14, 1949. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1972, and earned his M.A. at the University of San Diego in 1976. He earned his Master of Divinity degree from the Jesuit School of Theology, in Berke- ley, California in 1982 and his Ph.D. at the University of Wisconsin in 1987.

Father Engh taught at Loyola Marymount University from 1988 to 2008, became Santa Clara University’s 28th President on January 5, 2009, and retires from the Presidency after a most distinguished decade on June 30, 2019.

Father Engh serves on a number of boards, including the Board of Trustees of Boston Col- lege; the Board of Directors of the Silicon Val- ley Leadership Group; the Board of Directors of the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Uni- versities; the Council of Presidents of the
Graduate Theological Union; and the Board of Trustees of Bellarmine College Preparatory.

Since arriving at Santa Clara, Father Engh has led the University in defining its vision and setting the course for the future with a bold plan, Santa Clara 2020. Under his decade of leadership the University’s endowment grew to $926 million in 2019, from $515 million in 2009. The University also recorded significant student accomplishments and accolades including Rhodes and Fulbright Scholars.

Ten new undergraduate majors were instituted, several Masters programs were launched, and the REAL program for summer research in the College of Arts & Sciences began, among many others, and the Law School’s Intellectual Property Program was ranked fourth by US News in 2019. During Father Engh’s tenure the campus was beautified and improved, and many new buildings were opened and facilities modernized, with many more in the process of development.

The era of Father Engh bears the imprimatur of diversity and inclusion. He established the Office for Diversity and Inclusion in 2013 and created the Blue Ribbon Commission on Diversity and Inclusion in 2016, increasing significantly the number of students of color from 45 percent to 51 percent.

Sustainability has been a hallmark of the Engh presidency. He signed the Climate Neutrality Action Plan and established the Office of Sustainability which grew into the Center for Sustainability with additional staff and programming. His efforts resulted in a deep-seated culture of sustainability across the entire University and ingrained in the community the importance of justice and sustainability.

Madam Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring Father Michael Engh for his superb leadership of Santa Clara University which is not only a jewel in the crown of Jesuit universities but also one of the finest institutions of higher learning in the United States. His remarkable decade as President has strengthened our region, our state of California and he is a great blessing to our nation.
Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS


Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4587–S4667

Measures Introduced: Forty-nine bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1999–2047, S. Res. 267–271, and S. Con. Res. 21. Pages S4627–29

Measures Reported:

S. 580, to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the “Former Presidents Act of 1958”, with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–53) Page S4627

Measures Passed:

National Defense Authorization Act: By 86 yeas to 8 nays (Vote No. 188), Senate passed 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, by the order of the Senate of Wednesday, June 26, 2019, 60 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and after taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto:

- McConnell Amendment No. 862 (to Amendment No. 861), to change the enactment date. Page S4599
- Pending: Udall Amendment No. 883, to prohibit unauthorized military operations in or against Iran. Pages S4619–21

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

- By 87 yeas to 7 nays (Vote No. 186), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on McConnell (for Inhofe) Modified Amendment No. 764 (listed above). Page S4599
- McConnell motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 865, to change the enactment date, fell when cloture was invoked on McConnell (for Inhofe) Modified Amendment No. 764. Page S4600
- McConnell Amendment No. 866 (to the instructions Amendment No. 865), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 865 (listed above) fell. Page S4600
- McConnell Amendment No. 867 (to Amendment No. 866), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell Amendment No. 866 (to the instructions Amendment No. 865) fell. Pursuant to the order of Wednesday, June 26, 2019, the motion to invoke cloture on the bill was withdrawn. Page S4604
- A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of Udall Amendment No. 883 (listed above), to the bill, as amended, at approximately 5:00 a.m., on Friday, June 28, 2019, under the order of Wednesday, June 26, 2019.

TANF block grants: Senate passed H.R. 2940, to extend the program of block grants to States for
temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through September 30, 2019.  

Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program: Senate passed S. 2047, to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program.  

Stonewall uprising 50th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 270, recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Stonewall uprising.  

Collector Car Appreciation Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 271, designating July 12, 2019, as “Collector Car Appreciation Day” and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States.  

Columbia River In-Lieu and Treaty Fishing Access Sites Improvement Act: Senate passed S. 50, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:  

McConnell (for Hoeven) Amendment No. 904, to amend the authorization amount.  

Indian Community Economic Enhancement Act: Senate passed S. 212, to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:  

McConnell (for Hoeven) Amendment No. 905, to improve the Indian Economic Development Feasibility Study.  

Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon: Senate passed S. 832, to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865.  

Tanana Tribal Council and Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation: Senate passed S. 224, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska, and to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska.  

PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act: Senate passed S. 209, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes.  

Esther Martinez Native American Languages Programs Reauthorization Act: Senate passed S. 256, to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages.  

Native American Business Incubators Program Act: Senate passed S. 294, to establish a business incubators program within the Department of the Interior to promote economic development in Indian reservation communities.  

Tribal HUD–VASH Act: Senate passed S. 257, to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans.  

Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation Equitable Compensation Act: Senate passed S. 216, to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam.  


Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe Reservation Restoration Act: Senate passed S. 199, to provide for the transfer of certain Federal land in the State of Minnesota for the benefit of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe.  

National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month and National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 220, designating the month of June 2019 as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month” and June 27, 2019, as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day”, and the resolution was then agreed to.  

Signing Authority—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Majority Leader, and Senators Graham, Lankford, and Tillis be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions from June 27, 2019 through July 8, 2019.  

Authorizing Leadership To Make Appointments—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that, notwithstanding
the upcoming adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the Majority and Minority Leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

Pro Forma Sessions—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Tuesday, July 2, 2019, at 4:45 p.m.; Friday, July 5, 2019, at 11:45 a.m.; and that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, July 5, 2019, it next convene at 3 p.m., on Monday, July 8, 2019.

Bress Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, June 27, 2019, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, July 8, 2019.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.
- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.
- A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the nomination at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, July 8, 2019.

Leichty Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Damon Ray Leichty, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of T. Kent Wetherell II, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.
- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Ranjan Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of J. Nicholas Ranjan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Damon Ray Leichty, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.
- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

King Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of J. Nicholas Ranjan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.
- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.
Pallasch Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Page S4644

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.
- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Wright Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency.

Pages S4644–45

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.
- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during the session of Thursday, June 27, 2019 ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, July 8, 2019.

Page S4665

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

- Christopher Scolese, of New York, to be Director of the National Reconnaissance Office.
- Gary B. Burman, of Kentucky, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of four years.
- William D. Hyslop, of Washington, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Washington for the term of four years.
- Randall P. Huff, of Wyoming, to be United States Marshal for the District of Wyoming for the term of four years.
- Veronica Daigle, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Page S4642

Robert Wallace, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife.

Page S4642


Pages S4642–43

Lane Genatowski, of New York, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, Department of Energy.

Page S4643

Ronald Douglas Johnson, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of El Salvador.

Page S4643

David Michael Satterfield, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey.

Page S4643

Aditya Bamzai, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for the remainder of the term expiring January 29, 2020.

Page S4643

- Travis LeBlanc, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2022.
- 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.

Page S4643

- 2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.
- 29 Army nominations in the rank of general.
- 23 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.
- Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy.

Pages S4639–42

Messages from the House:

Pages S4625

Measures Referred:

Pages S4625

Executive Communications:

Pages S4625–26

Petitions and Memorials:

Pages S4626–27

Executive Reports of Committees:

Page S4627

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S4629–31

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S4631–35

Additional Statements:

Pages S4624–25

Amendments Submitted:

Pages S4638–39

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Page S4639

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S4639

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—188)

Pages S4599–S4600, S4604

Recess: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and recessed at 7:10 p.m., until 5 a.m. on Friday, June 28, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S4665.)
Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK
REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, after receiving testimony from Kimberly Reed, President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States.

NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine options for the interim and long-term storage of nuclear waste, including S. 1234, to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste, after receiving testimony from John Wagner, Associate Laboratory Director, Nuclear Science and Technology Directorate, Idaho National Laboratory, Department of Energy; Geoffrey H. Fettus, Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.; Maria Korsnick, Nuclear Energy Institute, Inc., both of Washington, D.C.; Steven P. Nesbit, American Nuclear Society Nuclear Waste Policy Task Force, Charlotte, North Carolina; and Wayne Norton, Yankee Atomic Electric Company, East Hampton, Connecticut, on behalf of the Decommissioning Plant Coalition Steering Committee.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Daniel Habib Jorjani, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor, and Mark Lee Greenblatt, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, both of the Department of the Interior.

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: 69 public bills, H.R. 3524–3592; and 7 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 50; and H. Res. 467–472 were introduced. Pages H5255–58

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H5260–61

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 466, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–130);

H.R. 3153, to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support research on opioid addiction, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–131);
H.R. 3196, to designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the “Vera Rubin Survey Telescope” (H. Rept. 116–132); Supplemental report on H.R. 2500, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–120, Part 2);
H.R. 1146, to amend Public Law 115–97 (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act) to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge oil and gas program, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–133);
H.R. 255, to provide for an exchange of lands with San Bernardino County, California, to enhance management of lands within the San Bernardino National Forest, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–134); and
H.R. 434, to designate the Emancipation National Historic Trail, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 116–135).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Escobar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 159 yea to 149 nays with one answering “present”, Roll No. 430.

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019—Rule for Consideration: The House began consideration of H. Res. 466, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, by a recorded vote of 305 ayes to 102 noes, Roll No. 429.

The House concurred in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3401), as amended by Representative McGovern, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 322 yeas to 85 nays, Roll No. 426, after the previous question was ordered on the amendment and the resolution without objection.

Permission to File Report: Agreed by unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to file a supplemental report on H.R. 2500, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3:30 p.m. tomorrow, June 28th.

Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group: Representatives Duffy, Hurd (TX), Cloud, and Spano.

Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy: Representative Rutherford.

Senate Referral: S. 528 was held at the desk.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H5241.
Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5225–26, H5242–43, H5244–45, H5245–46, H5249–50, and H5250. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

Committee Meetings

DOCUMENT PRODUCTION STATUS UPDATE: OPM, FBI, AND GSA

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled “Document Production Status Update: OPM, FBI, and GSA”. Testimony was heard from Robert Borden, Chief of Staff, General Services Administration; Stephen M. Billy, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of Personnel Management; and Jill Tyson, Assistant Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SENATE AMENDMENT TO THE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SECURITY AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER ACT, 2019

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on the Senate amendment to H.R. 3401, the “Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019”. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a rule providing for consideration of the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3401, the “Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019”. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–21. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion and the Senate amendment. The rule provides that the Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The rule provides one hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3494, the “Damon Paul Nelson and Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018, 2019, and 2020”; and to authorize all Members of the House of Representatives to review, at a time to be determined by the Committee, the Classified Annex to H.R. 3494, the “Damon Paul Nelson and Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018, 2019, and 2020”. H.R. 3494 was ordered reported, as amended. Adoption of the Classified Annex to Accompany H.R. 3494; and Authorization for Members to Review, for a Period of Three days in Advance of Floor consideration in the House of H.R. 3494, as amended, passed. This meeting was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D675)

S. 1379, to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response. Signed on June 24, 2019. (Public Law 116–22)


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”. Signed on June 25, 2019. (Public Law 116–24)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
5 a.m., Friday, June 28

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will continue consideration of Udall Amendment No. 883, and vote on adoption of the amendment, notwithstanding the passage of S. 1790, National Defense Authorization Act, as amended.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
3:30 p.m., Friday, June 28

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 3:30 p.m.
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