

HBCUs are an engine of economic growth in our communities because they expand the economic playing field to students from every background. Our economy works best when everyone has a shot at success.

As current funding to HBCUs is set to expire on September 30, it is critical that this legislation makes it across the finish line and onto the President's desk.

□ 1730

The FUTURE Act would provide funding to more than 100 HBCUs across 19 different States. It will allow universities and their students to continue down the pathway to success. In my view, having healthy HBCUs is critical for our State's economic future.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends again for their leadership on this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, but before I close, I do want to, first of all, thank both gentlemen from North Carolina, Representative WALKER and Representative BUDD, for their support of HBCUs.

Congressman WALKER is correct. He represents the largest public HBCU in the Nation, of which I had the privilege of studying at and graduating from twice, North Carolina A&T, and served that school for more than 40 years in the district.

I am watching Congressman WALKER, and I appreciate him and Representative BUDD and all the support they are giving to our HBCUs.

I taught 40 years at Bennett College in Greensboro, so HBCUs are really running through my veins.

Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD letters of support submitted by 36 individual schools—IHEs, HBCUs—for the passage of this bill, and I have some other documents that I also will include in the RECORD from NAFEO, UNCF, and TMCf, and also from Harry Williams from TMCf.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say before I close, Mr. BUDD mentioned a couple of those statistics about our schools.

Our schools, HBCUs, confer 40 percent of all STEM degrees, 60 percent of all engineering degrees. We educate 50 percent of African American teachers and 40 percent of African American health professionals. We produce 70 percent of African American dentists and physicians. I could go on and on.

Yes, there is a serious economic impact of about \$15 billion—\$14.8 billion, to be specific. We are not slouching. HBCUs are doing a lot with a little. We still don't receive equitable funding, but this, certainly, will help not only the colleges and universities, the MSIs, but it is also going to help our students—first-generation students, as I was—who have the privilege of going on and getting a good education from one of our Nation's best HBCUs.

Let me say before I close, I, again, thank both gentlemen, and I ask the House to approve H.R. 2486.

Mr. Speaker, I want to rebut a couple of things.

First, as has been explained, account maintenance fees are a dwindling source of funds. They have been made obsolete now, and they are being replaced by the Direct Loan Program. The funds now represent 3.5 percent of the average guaranty agency's total revenue, which last year totaled about \$4 billion. When the opposition talks about AMFs and how important they are, we have to note that they are referring to just 3.5 percent of \$4 billion.

I would also like to say that because funds from AMFs can be used for whatever purpose they desire, on the contrary, title III, part F only can be used for specific purposes that improve institutional stability and academic programs.

We don't want to be on record saying that \$140 million that may be used to help low-income students is more important than \$255 million that must help low-income students, which comprises about 60 percent of the population at our HBCUs, TCUs, and MSIs.

The other side says that the mandatory funds should not go to institutions, but account maintenance fees are exactly that. They are funds that must be paid by the government to private institutions.

Our HBCUs account for 3 percent of all colleges and universities. We graduate 10 percent of all Black college graduates, a third of Black STEM professionals.

Our TCUs serve geographically remote areas that help close gaps in healthcare services and formal education attainment in Tribal communities. Since 1965, the Federal Government has tried to atone for this neglect by providing institutional aid to these students.

To turn our backs on these schools by letting these important mandatory funds expire, which it has already been noted will expire in about 2 weeks, is unconscionable. It is a slap in the face to many who look to these schools as their ticket to the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, I have already submitted those documents for the RECORD, but I do want to urge all of my colleagues to pass this FUTURE Act. It is about the future of our schools, the future of our students, those who need that opportunity, the opportunity that W.E.B. Du Bois spoke about when he said, "Of all the civil rights for which the world has struggled and fought for 500 years, the right to learn is undoubtedly the most fundamental."

I thank my colleagues for continuing to believe in that fundamental right for these young people to have that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chamber again to support and champion our low-income, our first-generation college students by approving H.R. 2486, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I know Congresswoman ADAMS is yielding

back only because I am the Member who represents North Carolina A&T at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and with great big Aggie pride, I yield back the balance of my time as well.

Mr. SABLON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2486, the Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education (FUTURE) Act, which ensures federal funding for Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) across our nation, including Northern Marianas College, continues after September 30, 2019.

Enrolling two out of every three students of color, MSIs play an important role in providing access to a quality higher education and career opportunities. However, many of these schools, which serve over 25 percent of all undergraduates, have historically been underfunded which affects their ability to serve their students who primarily come from disadvantaged backgrounds. This is why Congress authorized funding for MSIs under the Higher Education Act to help students of color succeed through better access to degree programs that prepare them for in-demand jobs, academic counseling and other support services. Through this funding, Northern Marianas College established Project PROA which offers high school juniors, seniors and first-year college students free academic tutoring, college mentoring, counseling, and a center with access to computers while incorporating the indigenous Chamorro and Refaluwasch cultures. 86 percent of participants passed more than half of their classes after receiving Project PROA tutoring services.

Mandatory funding for these institutions will expire on September 30, 2019. The FUTURE Act, which I cosponsored, ensures this will not happen. Under H.R. 2486, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities, and Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions like Northern Marianas College will continue to receive \$255 million for the next two years. Should funding lapse, the impact would fall on students the most if schools have to make cuts to the very academic programs and services that were established to help them succeed.

I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina, Ms. ADAMS, for her leadership on this legislation and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2486.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2486, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON S. 1790, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1790) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House; to strike out all after the enacting clause of such bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 2500 as passed by the House; to pass the Senate bill, as amended; and to insist on the House

amendment thereto and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct conferees at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Thornberry moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the bill S. 1790 be instructed to agree to section 2906 of the Senate bill with the following amendments:

In subsection (a), strike "military construction projects authorized by such Acts" and insert "the military construction projects described in subsection (d)".

Add at the end the following new subsection:

(d) MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS DESCRIBED.—The military construction projects described in this subsection are the projects set forth in the following table:

Deferred military construction projects

State/Location	Installation	Project	Amount
Alabama	Anniston Army Depot	Weapon Maintenance Shop	\$5,200,000
Alaska	Eielson AFB	Repair Central Heat/Power Plant Boiler PH 4	\$41,000,000
	Eielson AFB	Repair Central Heat & Power Plant Boiler Ph3	\$34,400,000
	Eielson AFB	Eielson AFB Improved CATM Range ...	\$19,000,000
	Fort Greely	Missile Field #1 Expansion	\$8,000,000
Arizona	Fort Huachuca	Ground Transport Equipment Building	\$30,000,000
California	Channel Islands ANG S	Construct C-130J Flight Simulator Facility	\$8,000,000
		Space Control Facility	\$8,000,000
Colorado	Peterson AFB	Fire/Crash Rescue Station	\$17,000,000
Florida	Tyndall AFB	Consolidated Training Facility	\$5,500,000
Hawaii	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	Security Improvements Mokuapu Gate	\$26,492,000
	Kaneohe Bay	Railcar Holding Area	\$16,000,000
Indiana	Crane Army Ammunition Plant	Construct Small Arms Range	\$8,000,000
	Hulman Regional Airport	Ft Campbell Middle School	\$62,634,000
Kentucky	Fort Campbell, Kentucky	NORTHCOM - Construct Alert Apron ..	\$15,000,000
Louisiana	Joint Reserve Base New Orleans	NORTHCOM - Construct Alert Facilities	\$24,000,000
	Joint Reserve Base New Orleans	Cantonment Area Roads	\$16,500,000
Maryland	Fort Meade	PAR Relocate Haz Cargo Pad and EOD Range	\$37,000,000
	Joint Base Andrews	Child Development Center	\$13,000,000
Mississippi	Jackson IAP	Construct Small Arms Range	\$8,000,000
New Mexico	Holloman AFB	MQ-9 FTU Ops Facility	\$85,000,000
	White Sands	Information Systems Facility	\$40,000,000
New York	U.S. Military Academy	Engineering Center	\$95,000,000
	U.S. Military Academy	Parking Structure	\$65,000,000
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	2nd Radio BN Complex, Phase 2	\$25,650,000
	Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	Ambulatory Care Center Add-Alt	\$15,300,000
	Fort Bragg	Butner Elementary School Replacement	\$32,944,000
	Seymour Johnson AFB	KC-46A ADAL for Alt Mission Storage	\$6,400,000
Oklahoma	Tulsa IAP	Construct Small Arms Range	\$8,000,000
Oregon	Klamath Falls IAP	Construct Indoor Range	\$8,000,000
	Klamath Falls IAP	Replace Fuel Facilities	\$2,500,000
South Carolina	Beaufort	Laurel Bay Fire Station Replacement	\$10,750,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	Defense Access Roads	\$20,000,000
	Joint Base San Antonio	Camp Bullis Dining Facility	\$18,500,000
Utah	Hill AFB	Composite Aircraft Antenna Calibration Fac	\$26,000,000
	Hill AFB	UTTR Consolidated Mission Control Center	\$28,000,000
Virginia	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	Construct Cyber Ops Facility	\$10,000,000
	Norfolk	Replace Hazardous Materials Warehouse	\$18,500,000
	Pentagon	Pentagon Metro Entrance Facility	\$12,111,000
	Portsmouth	Replace Hazardous Materials Warehouse	\$22,500,000
	Portsmouth	Ships Maintenance Facility	\$26,120,000
Washington	Bangor	Pier and Maintenance Facility	\$88,960,000
Wisconsin	Truax Field	Construct Small Arms Range	\$8,000,000
Guam	Joint Region Marianas	Earth Covered Magazines	\$52,270,000
	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC Roads	\$2,500,000
	Joint Region Marianas	Water Well Field	\$56,088,000
	Joint Region Marianas	Navy-Commercial Tie-In Hardening ...	\$37,180,000
	Joint Region Marianas	Machine Gun Range	\$50,000,000
	Joint Region Marianas	APR - Munitions Storage Igloos, Ph 2 ..	\$35,300,000
	Joint Region Marianas	Hayman Munitions Storage Igloos MSA 2	\$9,800,000
	Joint Region Marianas	APR - SATCOM C4I Facility	\$14,200,000
Puerto Rico	Arroyo	Readiness Center	\$30,000,000
	Camp Santiago	Company Headquarters Bldg/-Transient Training	\$47,000,000

Deferred military construction projects—Continued

State/Location	Installation	Project	Amount
Virgin Islands	Camp Santiago	Dining Facility, Transient Training	\$13,000,000
	Camp Santiago	Engineering-Housing Maintenance Shops (DPW)	\$11,000,000
	Camp Santiago	Maneuver Area Training Equipment Site	\$80,000,000
	Camp Santiago	National Guard Readiness Center	\$50,000,000
	Camp Santiago	Power Substation-Switching Station Building	\$18,500,000
	Gurabo	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	\$28,000,000
	Punta Borinquen	Ramey Unit School Replacement	\$61,071,000
	San Juan	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar (AASF)	\$64,000,000
	St. Croix	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	\$20,000,000
	St. Croix	Power Substation-Switching Station Building	\$3,500,000
	St. Thomas	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop Add-Alt	\$3,875,000
	Overseas	Various Locations	\$1,836,755,000
	Various Locations	Various Projects	

Mr. THORNBERRY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the motion be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Speaker, this motion to instruct conferees instructs the House conferees to agree to the Senate position to replace money transferred from out of the military construction projects under title X, section 2808.

Just to clarify, when the Senate passed its bill, we didn't know which specific projects we were talking about. The Senate has, in its bill, a provision to replace the full \$3.6 billion that was then expected to be transferred out of military construction and used for border security.

Well, now we know what specific projects those are, so the only difference in the motion and this underlying Senate provision is to list the specific projects.

It is important to remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate passed its bill replacing the full \$3.6 billion by a vote of 86-8. Three Republicans and five Democrats voted "no" on the whole measure, but, overwhelmingly, they supported the bill that includes a provision to replace this money.

Each of the projects that is listed in the motion to instruct has been specifically authorized and appropriated by the House and the Senate and signed into law by the President.

Now, it is true that the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Esper, has tried to minimize the effects on our military when this transfer was made. But it is still true, even with his efforts, that there was \$544 million taken away from

dependent schools, \$13 million taken away from child dependent centers, \$15.3 million from medical clinics, more money from fire stations, dining facilities, et cetera.

Despite his best efforts, our troops are affected by the transfer of this money.

Mr. Speaker, we are really good at fighting, arguing, and pointing fingers of blame about how this came to be, and I am sure we all have different opinions about that. But voting "yes" or "no" on this motion to instruct will not change that at all, will not change the transfer, will not change any of those underlying facts.

The only thing that we have an ability to influence with this motion to instruct is whether or not the troops have to suffer as a result of Washington dysfunction. It will make a difference to them.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the right thing to do for national security and, certainly, the right thing to do for our troops is for the House to instruct our conferees to agree with the Senate provision, the only difference being we would list the specific projects rather than the total amount. That way, we can ensure that, as we continue to argue about border security and a whole variety of other issues, our troops do not suffer as a result of that argument.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to make sure everyone understands: This provision is actually completely irrelevant. It will impact nothing, from a substantive standpoint.

There is no way our troops are going to be harmed whether we pass this instruction or whether we follow this instruction or not. That is important to understand.

We authorize military construction projects, when we authorize them, for 5 years. Every single project that the President has listed as the ones that he has stolen the money from to build the border wall that Congress expressly

said they did not want to spend this money on is already authorized.

Whether or not we put an additional authorization into the fiscal year 2020 defense bill is, literally, irrelevant.

□ 1745

It has no impact whatsoever on whether or not the troops, their families, whatever the construction projects are, get funded or not. That will be a DOD decision. They have the authority to do it. How do they wish to spend their money?

So please don't let anyone say on this motion to instruct that if you don't vote for it, you are voting to not fund these projects. You are not. All of them are authorized for 5 years. There are a couple of projects that were first authorized in 2016, but we are in that 5-year window for every single project in question, so this has nothing to do with that.

What this amounts to is a sense of Congress on whether or not we ought to allow a President to effectively steal \$3.6 billion out of the Pentagon's budget for his own personal policy desire that Congress has already said they shouldn't.

And in a bipartisan way, I am quite certain, but for the politics surrounding this issue, that Congress would emphatically say "no." If we pass a defense budget that says this is where you ought to spend the money, we are not saying, Mr. President, here's a piggy bank. Have fun with it. Okay? If you find something, and it is \$3.6 billion out of the military construction fund—it is actually a little over \$6 billion total that the President took out of the FY19 defense budget to build a wall that Congress said they did not want.

I think this has huge implications and, as members of the Armed Services Committee, we ought to be alarmed about this. And I can guarantee you that if President Obama had done this to the defense budget, for any reason, there would have been no end to the fury about it, and rightly so. Because if we are going to say, Look, the defense budget is crucially important—in fact, particularly the members of the minority party in this body have frequently

argued that the defense budget is underfunded. They will give you chapter and verse and, in fact, did just a couple of months ago, about all the areas in our defense budget that don't have enough money.

Now they are standing up and saying, as short as the defense budget is, as much as we have claimed that there is not enough money in the defense budget, we are perfectly okay with the President taking \$6 billion out of it for something that has nothing to do with the Department of Defense. That is an appalling position for any member of the Armed Services Committee to take.

This motion to instruct, while irrelevant substantially, does give us the opportunity to express the sense of Congress that this should not be done for any purpose.

It is worth noting that we had a big fight about 6, 7 months ago when we shut down the government. The President said he wanted to have his wall funding, and we entered into a negotiation and, at the end of it, I think we came up with about \$1.5 billion that we allowed the President for his wall. So we had that fight.

And after that fight, he decided that the Pentagon was just one big piggy bank; that what we do over here is all kinds of irrelevant. We are throwing money out there and the President can grab it for any purpose.

I will just close by saying, I disagree with one statement that the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee said, and that is, you know, We can all argue about who is responsible for this.

Seriously?

It is pretty clear who is responsible for this. The President of the United States decided to take this \$3.6 billion out of existing Pentagon projects and spend it on his wall after Congress said they didn't want it to be done.

Now you want to argue that he should have, because for whatever reason, that is fine. But there is no question why we are here. And there is no question that if Congress endorses this, if Congress says it is okay for the President of the United States to use the Pentagon as his own personal piggy bank—personal is a bit of an overstatement; I understand this is policy—but basically to decide to spend money wherever he wants to spend it, irrespective of what we say, why are we even here?

Why do we even bother to authorize what the Pentagon is doing?

So, again, these projects are already authorized. If the Pentagon wants to go find the money in the \$738 billion that we have now all agreed that we are going to spend, they can go find it. But there is no way that the United States Congress ought to even irrelevantly endorse this particular action by the President.

I would strongly urge every Member to reject this motion to instruct.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time and for his leadership on our committee.

I rise in support of Ranking Member THORNBERRY's motion to instruct conferees. It is vital that Congress fund all of the projects that have been listed today as we vote later. The Senate did the right thing, and now the House should follow suit.

Securing our border is a vital component to national security. If we can't control our borders, then we cannot tell the American people they are secure at home.

Even President Obama's former Attorney General, Eric Holder, said just this week: "Democrats have to understand that borders mean something."

This motion to instruct conferees supports the President's task of keeping America safe. It also supports our military by funding construction projects, including the weapons maintenance shop at Anniston Army Depot in my district. This project would consolidate maintenance operations that currently happen in different buildings in different States under one roof. This facility is in preparation for future modernizations in support of our force readiness.

This is a simple vote today for securing our borders and building projects for the military. I urge support of this motion.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to quickly point out, again, this doesn't make any difference in terms of whether or not these projects get funded.

Then, second, I think the gentleman is correct. This is a debate about whether or not it makes sense to spend money on the wall. But I just want to emphasize two points about that:

One, regardless how you feel about the wall, you should not be in favor of being able to simply take the money out of the Pentagon to pay for it.

Second, the border crisis that we have is not going to be even remotely alleviated by a wall. The border crisis that we have right now is asylum seekers pouring up to the border and turning themselves in. Now, there are all kinds of challenges associated with that, no question, and all kinds of policies that have led to that happening.

I think it is absolutely shameful right now the way the United States of America is handling this. So many people are seeking refuge from violence and horrific conditions, and we are treating them horribly; and there is a lot that we need to do to change that.

But building a wall will not stop asylum seekers. It is a billion-dollar waste of money focusing on a campaign promise instead of focusing on the ac-

tual problem that we have. But, again, that is a debate that Congress should have. They should not have it out of the Pentagon budget. This is the wrong place for it.

I urge Members to reject this Presidential grab of money out of the Pentagon that would set a very dangerous precedent.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time other than myself to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Earlier, the term was used that the President had stolen, or would steal this money. Actually, section 2808 authorizes any President, when a national emergency is declared, to transfer military construction funds to deal with that situation.

Now, again, we will debate about whether this was a true national emergency, and whether he should or should not have done it here. But the President did exactly what he has the authority to do. The only question is, what are—who is going to suffer because of that.

As the gentleman from Alabama pointed out, no President and no Member of Congress ought to have to choose between border security and supporting our troops. And yet, that is, unfortunately, the situation that, without adopting this motion to instruct, Members are put into.

The administration requested specifically, in the fiscal year 2020 budget request, that this \$3.6 billion which was transferred out of military construction be put back into military construction so that these projects could be funded.

Now, you can have a 5-year authorization, but you have got to have the money that year in order to actually build them. And so that is what the Senate did in their provision. That is what this motion to instruct would instruct the House conferees to do, with more specificity.

Mr. Speaker, just so Members have a general idea, we are talking about a weapons maintenance shop in Alabama, central heat and power in the State of Alaska. Arizona has a ground transport equipment building. California has a C-130 simulator. Colorado, a space control facility; Florida, fire crash rescue station; Hawaii, security improvements for a gate; Indiana, construct a small arms range; Kentucky, Fort Campbell Middle School. Those are some of the specific projects, and I could go on. Louisiana has NORTHCOM, various air facility improvements; Maryland, a child development center at Joint Base Andrews; New Mexico, an MQ-9 ops facility.

Specific projects are listed in this motion to instruct, specific projects

which FY20 money would then fund, if the conferees would agree to what the Senate has already agreed to and what the motion seeks to get the House to endorse.

Again, Mr. Speaker, bottom line, there is a lot of argument on border issues. There is a lot of dysfunction in Washington these days. But our troops and their families should not suffer the consequences of those arguments and that dysfunction.

This motion to instruct offers a path forward to at least ensure that they have some insulation from those differences, and I urge Members to adopt it.

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 instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1423, FORCED ARBITRATION INJUSTICE REPEAL ACT; WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mrs. TORRES of California, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-210) on the resolution (H. Res. 558) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1423) to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and providing for con-

sideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to instruct on S. 1790; and

The motion to permit closed conference meetings on S. 1790, if offered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON S. 1790, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the motion to instruct on the bill (S. 1790) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 219, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

YEAS—198

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger

Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer

Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube

Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Torres Small
(NM)
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—219

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett

Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)

Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider