The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 6395 is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1711

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.

WILLIAM M. (MAC) THORNBERRY NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6395) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 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, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 116–457 on which further proceedings were postponed on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 190, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—215

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—190

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
Delgado
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Lipinski
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Norman
Nunes
Palazzo
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiffany
Tipton
Torres Small (NM)
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—24

Abraham
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Byrne
Fortenberry
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Hudson
Kaptur
King (IA)
Loudermilk
Marchant
McHenry
Mullin
Newhouse
Olson
Palmer
Peterson
Roby
Rooney (FL)
Schakowsky
Timmons

□ 1754

Messrs. GREEN of Tennessee and STIVERS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas (Sánchez)
Case (Cartwright)
Clay (Grijalva)
DeFazio (Bonamici)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Frankel (Clark (MA))
Garamendi (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Gomez (Gallego)
Horsford (Kildee)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Khanna (Sherman)
Kirkpatrick (Gallego)
Kuster (NH) (Brownley (CA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McEachin (Wexton)
Moore (Beyer)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano (Correa)
Pascrell (Sires)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Cicilline)
Porter (Wexton)
Pressley (Omar)
Price (NC) (Butterfield)
Richmond (Butterfield)
Rush (Underwood)
Serrano (Jeffries)
Thompson (MS) (Fudge)
Trone (Beyer)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCADAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the adoption of amendment No. 4, printed in House Report No. 116–457, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCADAMS).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 179, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—227

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
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)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—179

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Murphy (NC)
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiffany
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—23

Abraham
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Byrne
Fortenberry
Griffith
Hudson
Kaptur
King (IA)
Loudermilk
Marchant
McHenry
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Palmer
Peterson
Roby
Rooney (FL)
Schakowsky
Stivers
Timmons

□ 1833

Mr. VAN DREW changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas (Sánchez)
Case (Cartwright)
Clay (Grijalva)
Defazio (Bonamici)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Frankel (Clark (MA))
Garamendi (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Gomez (Gallego)
Horsford (Kildee)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Khanna (Sherman)
Kirkpatrick (Gallego)
Kuster (NH) (Brownley (CA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McEachin (Wexton)
Moore (Beyer)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano (Correa)
Pascrell (Sires)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Cicilline)
Porter (Wexton)
Pressley (Omar)
Price (NC) (Butterfield)
Richmond (Butterfield)
Rush (Underwood)
Serrano (Jeffries)
Thompson (MS) (Fudge)
Trone (Beyer)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the adoption of amendments en bloc No. 1, printed in House Report No. 116–457, offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 336, nays 71, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—336

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Axne
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Dunn
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Holding
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips

Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Riggleman
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young

NAYS—71

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Banks
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Budd
Burchett
Cline
Cloud
Davidson (OH)
Duncan
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Gaetz
Gohmert
Gooden
Gosar
Grothman
Guest
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Johnson (LA)
Jordan
Keller
Kelly (MS)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lesko
Marshall
Massie
McClintock
Miller
Mooney (WV)
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pence
Perry
Posey
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Steube
Tiffany
Tipton
Tlaib
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Womack
Wright
Yoho
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—22

Abraham
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Byrne
Griffith
Hudson
Kaptur
King (IA)
Loudermilk
Marchant
McHenry
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Palmer
Peterson
Roby
Rooney (FL)
Schakowsky
Timmons
Walker

□ 1908

Messrs. KELLER and ZELDIN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on July 20, 2020, because I was not in D.C. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: "No" on rollcall No. 139; "No" on rollcall No. 140; "No" on rollcall No. 141; "No" on rollcall No. 142; and "No" on rollcall No. 143.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on Monday, July 20 due to a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: "nay" on rollcall No. 139; "nay" on rollcall No. 140; "nay" on rollcall No. 141; "nay" on rollcall No. 142; and "yea" on rollcall No. 143.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas (Sánchez)
Case (Cartwright)
Clay (Grijalva)
Defazio (Bonamici)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Frankel (Clark (MA))
Garamendi (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Gomez (Gallego)
Horsford (Kildee)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Khanna (Sherman)
Kirkpatrick (Gallego)
Kuster (NH) (Brownley (CA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McEachin (Wexton)
Moore (Beyer)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano (Correa)
Pascrell (Sires)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Cicilline)
Porter (Wexton)
Pressley (Omar)
Price (NC) (Butterfield)
Richmond (Butterfield)
Rush (Underwood)
Serrano (Jeffries)
Thompson (MS) (Fudge)
Trone (Beyer)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASTEN of Illinois). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 116–457.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12___. CLARIFICATION AND EXPANSION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION OF NORD STREAM 2 OR TURKSTREAM PIPELINE PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 7503 of the Protecting Europe's Energy Security Act of 2019 (title LXXV of Public Law 116–92; 22 U.S.C. 9526 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or pipelaying activities'' after ''pipe-laying''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by inserting '', or significantly facilitated the sale, lease, or provision of,'' after ''provided''; and

(ii) by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) provided significant underwriting services or insurance for those vessels; or

''(iv) provided significant services or facilities for technology upgrades or installation of welding equipment for, or retrofitting or tethering of, those vessels.''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (i) of such section is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) PIPE-LAYING ACTIVITIES.—The term 'pipe-laying activities' means activities that facilitate pipe-laying, including site preparation, trenching, surveying, placing rocks, stringing, bending, welding, coating, lowering of pipe, and backfilling.''.

(c) CLARIFICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect in accordance with (d) of section 7503 of the Protecting Europe's Energy Security Act of 2019 (22 U.S.C. 9526 note).

(d) INTERIM REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable and not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall submit a report on the matters required by subsection (a) of section 7503 of the Protecting Europe's Energy Security Act of 2019 (22 U.S.C. 9526 note), as amended by this section, with respect to the period—

(A) beginning on the later of—

(i) the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(ii) the date of the most recent submission of a report required by such section 7503; and

(B) ending on the date on which the report required by this subparagraph is submitted.

(2) TREATMENT.—A report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) submitted to the same committees as a report submitted under subsection (a) of such section 7503; and

(B) otherwise treated as a report submitted under such subsection (a) for purposes of all authorities granted by such section pursuant to such a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment that closes some loopholes on sanctions that we in the House put on Nord Stream 2 in December.

It is a simple amendment. It extends sanctions to activities that are needed to finish the pipeline and companies that choose to insure the Russian ships that will likely do that work.

These sanctions are necessary to ensure that the Russian Government isn't able to coerce our European friends by controlling their energy supply. We need to close these loopholes as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, we know how Vladimir Putin operates like a two-bit gangster. He only knows corrupt power politics. And Nord Stream 2 is an attempt to increase leverage over Europe, a Europe that is and must remain whole and free.

In addition to Putin's tendencies, we also know that Russia is a petrostate that really only has one industry, oil and gas. We know how Russia uses gas shipments as a power tactic.

How could we forget that they coerced Ukraine with gas cutoffs just a few years ago? They have only gotten worse since then.

Mr. Speaker, I know that some of our European friends oppose sanctions. They are trying to get cheaper energy for their people. I get that. But when Russians come bearing gifts, we should know better than to accept them at face value, not after Crimea, not after Georgia, not after assassinating people all across Europe, sponsoring coups, and attacking our elections.

Now is not the time to be letting the Russians off the hook. Vote ''yes.''

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Let's be clear, if our aim is to push back on Russian aggression and hold Vladimir Putin accountable, this amendment will accomplish none of that.

Nord Stream 2 is a menace to peace and security in Europe, period. It is Putin's transparent attempt to make Europe more dependent on Russian energy, to tighten Russia's grip, and to put down deeper roots to fracture European resolve.

□ 1915

If we want to disrupt Nord Stream 2, where should we turn up the heat? On Russia. On Putin and the oligarchs who stand to reap billions with this.

What does this amendment do? It goes after our allies. It targets German companies, European enterprises, maybe even Americans. But consequences for Russia? Forget about it.

Spit on our closest friends, let Russia off the hook, it doesn't seem right to me.

Sound familiar? It is the same refrain we have heard again and again. This is not good, and it should not pass.

How are we even debating this? The amendments I offered with Chairwoman WATERS to address Russian bounties on American lives and pushing back on Russian election interference? Out of order. Nobody would go along with those.

The measure Chairman SCHIFF and I authored to prevent the collapse of the New START treaty, the last remaining safeguard on Russia expanding its nuclear arsenal unchecked? Out of order.

The Republicans and Democrats loved this treaty when it was ratified. There was cross-party support for nuclear modernization, but they are offering a collective shrug now that the clock is ticking on its expiration.

Mr. Speaker, the National Defense Authorization Act has long stood as a pillar of bipartisanship in advancing our security interests, but right now, the Republicans seem to be backing out of this. So guess what? We have to make sure that certain priorities are not passed because that is not the direction we should go in.

I am the chairman of the most bipartisan committee in Congress, and that is too high a price to pay for bipartisanship.

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GALLEGO for yielding the time.

Last year, this Congress came together to oppose Putin's attempts to weaponize Europe's energy resources. I stand here today to urge my colleagues to continue to stand firm against Russia's coercive tactics.

With the 1,200-kilometer Nord Stream 2 pipeline nearly completed, time is running out. Should Putin be able to finish the remaining 100 kilometers of pipe, the energy security of the entire continent would be compromised.

Let us not forget that Russia has cut energy supplies to Ukraine in the past and is illegally occupying parts of the country. With an even greater stranglehold on Europe's energy market, Putin could exert his influence to devastating effect.

This amendment we debate today only clarifies and expands on sanctions that were passed last year. It will also put Vladimir Putin and his cronies on notice that they will not profit from the weaponization of Europe's energy markets.

Some critics argue that a new round of sanctions on Nord Stream 2 would infringe on European security and sovereignty. In reality, the opposite is true. The completion of the pipeline and the result would increase Europe's energy dependence on Russia and present a real danger to European security and sovereignty.

Moreover, most EU members, including Poland and the Baltic states, oppose the NS2 pipeline project and are concerned it would give Russia greater political and economic leverage over Germany and the rest of Europe.

In fact, the European Parliament, in 2019, adopted a resolution opposing Nord Stream 2 and said that the pipeline would reinforce the EU's dependence on Russian gas supplies.

If completed, this pipeline would prove a powerful geopolitical weapon for Putin that could weaken and divide Europe. The narrow expansion of sanctions called for in this amendment seeks to prevent Putin from ever wielding this weapon to advance his malign agenda in Europe.

Again, I want to thank Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. TURNER, and the rest of the cosponsors for their support of this legislation.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Committee on Foreign Affairs Chairman ENGEL, for his comments, and I thank him for his effort to make this amendment better.

This amendment includes all the Foreign Affairs Committee's edits, and it is through his leadership they were able to be tailored to the right targets.

Sanctions are a tough thing to do and to get right. For sanctions to work, they need to bite. These do, but in a tailored, discrete way, thanks to the cooperation of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Financial Services Committee, and the minority.

Additionally, I would like to point out something else. This amendment expands the list of activities that can be sanctioned, from pipe laying to pipeline activities. A wider set of sanctions are needed for Moscow to finish its power grab. These include site prep, trenching, surveying, placing rocks, stringing, bending, et cetera. I was actually surprised when I first heard how many activities were still allowed under the sanctions we passed in December.

Lastly, I also want to thank the chairman for his tireless work to push back on the Russians in defense of our allies and to also thank him for his lifelong work and dedication to this Congress. This is critical work, and I look forward to continuing to work with him in that effort.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I first thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) for really terrific work on this. He did so much to move this forward, and it was a pleasure having our staffs work together, and I thank him very much for that.

Mr. Speaker, for years, I have been sounding the alarm on Nord Stream 2. I have warned about the dangers of allowing Putin and Russia to strengthen their hand by making Europe more dependent on Russian energy. I have supported dozens of other efforts to hold Putin accountable and demand that there be consequences for his aggression.

If I thought this amendment would ratchet up pressure on Putin and his cronies, I would be the first to support it. Instead, I believe this measure lets Putin off the hook while placing all the consequences for Nord Stream 2 on our friends and allies. I think it is just a wrong direction to go.

If we are serious about making Putin pay a price, we should defeat this amendment and go back to the drawing board. I won't call for a vote by the yeas and nays on this measure, but I will oppose it, and I urge all Members to do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO).

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MS. ADAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 116–457.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In subtitle E of title XVII, add at the end the following:

SEC. ___. TEMPORARY RELIEF FOR PRIVATE STUDENT LOAN BORROWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A servicer of a private education loan extended to a covered borrower shall suspend all payments on such loan through September 30, 2021.

(b) NO ACCRUAL OF INTEREST.—Interest shall not accrue on a loan described under subsection (a) for which payment was suspended for the period of the suspension.

(c) CONSIDERATION OF PAYMENTS.—A servicer of a private education loan extended to a covered borrower shall deem each month for which a loan payment was suspended under this section as if the borrower of the loan had made a payment for the purpose of any loan forgiveness program or loan rehabilitation program for which the borrower would have otherwise qualified.

(d) REPORTING TO CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—During the period in which a loan payment was suspended under this section, the servicer of the loan shall ensure that, for the purpose of reporting information about the loan to a consumer reporting agency, any payment that has been suspended is treated as if it were a regularly scheduled payment made by a borrower.

(e) SUSPENDING INVOLUNTARY COLLECTION.—During the period for which a loan payment was suspended under this section, the servicer or holder of the loan shall suspend all involuntary collection related to the loan.

(f) NOTICE TO BORROWERS AND TRANSITION PERIOD.—To inform covered borrowers of the actions taken in accordance with this section and ensure an effective transition, the servicer of a private education loan extended to a covered borrower shall—

(1) not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, notify covered borrowers—

(A) of the actions taken in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) for whom payments have been suspended and interest waived;

(B) of the actions taken in accordance with subsection (e) for whom collections have been suspended;

(C) of the option to continue making payments toward principal; and

(D) that the program under this section is a temporary program; and

(2) beginning on August 1, 2020, carry out a program to provide not less than 6 notices by postal mail, telephone, or electronic communication to covered borrowers indicating when the borrower's normal payment obligations will resume.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED BORROWER.—The term ''covered borrower'' means a borrower of a private education loan.

(2) PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—The term ''private education loan'' has the meaning given the term in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

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

I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 6395, the William M. Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021.

As we debate this important legislation today, we must remain laser-focused on how our fellow Americans, servicemen, and veterans continue to face incredible challenges due to the COVID–19 pandemic.

In particular, I remain concerned about the student loan crisis that existed long before the pandemic paralyzed our economy and threw tens of millions of Americans out of their jobs. Student loan debt has surpassed credit cards and auto loans as the largest debt held by consumers, second only to mortgages.

According to the Federal Reserve, more than 40 million Americans hold $1.6 trillion in cumulative student loan debt. In 2019, private student loans comprised nearly 8 percent of the outstanding balances, amounting to roughly $123 billion.

This crushing student loan debt reduces homeownership, jeopardizes retirement security, and limits the formation of small businesses.

We also know that many Americans were struggling to repay their student loans before the pandemic. Now, it has only gotten worse.

Prior to COVID–19, more than one in seven student loan borrowers were more than 90 days delinquent, and almost half did not pay down their balances over the previous quarter.

That is why we created protections for student borrowers in the CARES Act. In CARES, we granted people with Federal student loans a break from their payments until next September.

Unfortunately, private student loan borrowers continue to find themselves with very few relief options. During the pandemic, the number of private student borrowers not making repayment progress has increased by 36 percent.

Even though Congress has passed a number of bills to provide relief during these difficult times, we have left millions of Americans uncovered and without necessary protections.

That is why I proposed an amendment with the NDAA that is simple and fair. It would extend the CARES student loan protections that were provided to Federal student loan borrowers to private student loan borrowers who were left out. This would include a pause in borrower payment obligations, in accrual of interest, in negative credit reporting, and in debt collection.

Additionally, the CARES student loan protections expire on September 30, 2020, and the pandemic and the economic fallout do not appear to be ending in the near future. So, the amendment extends the private student loan protections an additional year, until September 30.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment under consideration is, first and foremost, bad for borrowers but is also another partisan attempt to complete the socialist takeover of the student loan marketplace.

This debate detracts from the underlying bill's important work of providing for the national defense. In a functioning Congress, this student loan policy dispute would be reserved for the committee of jurisdiction, not the National Defense Authorization Act.

While the amendment may sound beneficial to private loan borrowers, it inserts the Federal Government into private transactions in which neither party asked for assistance.

The authors of this amendment assume prior education loan borrowers are all struggling to meet their obligation and that borrowers need a yearlong reprieve from making their agreed-upon payments.

The fact is, private student loan borrowers must typically go through rigorous underwriting standards and find a cosigner before taking on debt. These critical features lead to a much better performing portfolio than the Federal student loan program. Only 2.7 percent of private student loans are in default, compared with the Federal student loan cohort default rate of over 10 percent. There are existing options like forbearance to weather the storm without Federal Government interference.

Indeed, there are many examples of private student loan companies creating COVID–19-specific relief options for their borrowers. That is the beauty of a competitive marketplace. When there is consumer demand, the market incentive will generate creative solutions.

The truth is, borrowers benefit from making consistent payments and paying off their debt as quickly as possible. Congressional mandates to block this healthy habit can have negative outcomes for the borrowers.

Furthermore, the proposal would not reimburse private lenders for this forced hiatus, which would likely lead to a collapse of the industry and complete the Federal takeover of student loans.

I urge my colleagues to object to the inclusion of this misguided policy. We can and must do better for students across the country. The best way we can serve our constituents is to have a robust debate within the proper committees of jurisdiction.

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the gentlewoman that, since March, this body has provided $600 billion in funds for the Paycheck Protection Program. But because of shoddy implementation, the administration lavished billions on this Nation's country clubs and private jet companies and other entities of the 1 percent. That doesn't even include the multiple tax breaks and the advantages for corporations that were written into the

CARES Act, which, combined, equal as much as the amount spent to provide Americans with $1,200 in a stimulus check.

□ 1930

So, Mr. Speaker, why is it that it is only socialism when we endeavor to provide relief to working-class or middle-class Americans? Why are American taxpayer dollars only sacred when we try to provide for those who are in need the most?

We are living in unprecedented times, and so we need an unprecedented response. People are struggling. They are trying truly to get by, no fault of their own.

We know that supporting our fellow Americans will require significant investments and funding, so let's find the courage and let's have some compassion to provide the financial support that student loan relief could do that they urgently need.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This amendment is bad policy. It involves the Federal Government in completely private transactions and attempts to solve a problem the facts suggest does not exist.

Again, the people who borrowed this money agreed to pay it back. They are not victims.

This is a trend of our colleagues never to hold people responsible for their actions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, with 32 million Americans receiving unemployment benefits, nearly 20 percent of our workforce is in need of relief.

And, yes, folks who have loans and folks who signed a contract to pay rent and their mortgage, because of this pandemic and they have lost jobs, they can't do that.

You know, according to one higher education expert's calculations, some 10 billion student loan borrowers could be out of work amid the recession, and right now, the most important expenses for Americans are food, medical care, housing, and utilities.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to operate from a place of compassion and fairness. As Members of Congress, we are blessed to have jobs. No one here has lost a paycheck. We have health insurance and all the other basic needs that we have, so the least that we can do is provide a temporary economic life raft to our fellow citizens. This amendment gives us the opportunity to help those in need.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19, printed in House Report 116–457.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10___. REQUIREMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH USE OF PERSONNEL OTHER THAN THE MILITIA OR THE ARMED FORCES TO SUPPRESS INTERFERENCE WITH STATE AND FEDERAL LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 253 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''The President''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) USE OF OTHER MEANS.—(1) Other means used by the President pursuant to subsection (a) may only include activities by Federal law enforcement officers.

''(2) Any Federal law enforcement officer performing duty pursuant to subsection (a) shall visibly display on the uniform or other clothing of such officer—

''(A) the name of such officer; and

''(B) the name of the agency for which such officer is employed.

''(3) In this subsection:

''(A) The term 'Federal law enforcement officer' means—

''(i) an employee or officer in a position in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Federal Government who—

''(I) is authorized by law to engage in or supervise a law enforcement function; or

''(II) has statutory powers of arrest or apprehension under section 807(b) of this title (article 7(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice); or

''(ii) an employee or officer of a contractor or subcontractor (at any tier) of an agency in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Federal Government who is authorized by law or under the contract with the agency to engage in or supervise a law enforcement function; and

''(B) The term 'law enforcement function' means the prevention, detection, or investigation of, or the prosecution or incarceration of any person for, any violation of law.''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall be construed to limit or otherwise supersede the authority of Federal law enforcement officials who do not wear a uniform in the regular performance of their official duties or who are engaged in undercover operations to perform their official duties under authorities other than section 253 of title 10, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

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

Several weeks ago, we learned that the President was considering, and the Secretary of Defense was preparing for, the possibility of deploying Active-Duty Forces under the authorities of the Insurrection Act.

The Insurrection Act was not invoked in this case, but for many Americans, it was the first time hearing of a law that was originally drafted more than 200 years ago.

For many of our men and women in uniform, it was the first time since taking the sacred oath to protect and defend that they imagined that they might be deployed against their own fellow citizens, not against a foreign adversary.

Many of us were troubled to watch as members of our National Guard were deployed in the Washington, D.C., area as part of our response to the recent protests.

In the Armed Services Committee markup and earlier today, we heard a robust debate about this centuries-old authority, and that is healthy for our democracy.

Personally, I believe these authorities have done some good in our Nation's history. The Insurrection Act authorities were instrumental in enforcement of civil rights laws when some States were resistant.

This amendment, my amendment, is very narrow in scope.

Currently, title X, section 253 of the U.S. Code reads: ''The President, by using the militia or the Armed Forces, or both, or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy. . . . '' And then it goes on, but it never says what is meant by ''any other means.'' My amendment would say that ''any other means'' is limited to Federal law enforcement officers who are clearly identifiable by name and agency.

In the difficult scenario in which the Insurrection Act truly must be invoked, we cannot afford uncertainty. Our military members are clearly identifiable, and so must our law enforcement officers be as well. Blurry lines and uncertainty harm everyone and put everyone at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the engagement and support of my colleague from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL). He is the proud father of a son who is a police officer, and he has joined me in this effort after a discussion of our mutual objectives during the Armed Services Committee debate on this amendment.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

For 53 days, 7½ weeks, Portland, Oregon, has been burning. Three weeks ago, we saw the Democrats' response on the House floor. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Chairman NADLER, said antifa is imaginary. Tell that to the people of Portland, who have seen antifa for 53 days rioting, looting, stealing, destroying property, and attacking police officers.

This amendment is no good. This amendment limits the authority of the President under the Insurrection Act when he needs to ''suppress insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy.''

The Insurrection Act has been used by many Presidents to address domestic violence and riots, including Presidents Roosevelt, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. Both parties have used it when necessary, but now that President Trump mentions using this to address the widespread violence and destruction across the Nation, the Democrat majority wants to put restrictions on it.

I tell you what. The police chief in Chicago, where 49 officers were systematically attacked by the mob Friday night, just said he would welcome Federal help to deal with what the mob is doing. He knows antifa is not imaginary. And Andy Ngo, the journalist who was attacked by antifa, knows it is not imaginary.

This amendment is not what we need to be adopting. This amendment would mean that the President cannot use non-Federal law enforcement resources under the law that authorizes him to suppress insurrection.

Why in the world would we want to limit the options of the President to deal with the situation we find ourselves in?

Under Federal law, it is a crime to incite, assist, or engage in such conduct against the United States. This amendment, as I said, would limit the President's available options and resources to address real threats to our Union.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this amendment requires the Federal officers to identify themselves. That is the primary purpose of this amendment, not to limit the President.

We see what is going on in Portland right now, which is deeply disturbing for people in the military. We have people who are wearing fatigues, who appear to be U.S. military to the casual observer. They are not U.S. military. This undermines the credibility of our military to have people out there pretending to be them when they are not.

What this amendment requires is, if you are going to use this law, identify yourself.

It is deeply disturbing to the U.S. military to have people, effectively, impersonating them. They should clearly identify who they are working for if they are acting under the law of the United States.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, it is unusual, I know, to have a Republican standing here in support of this amendment while a Republican from the Judiciary Committee opposes it, but like many Americans, I was concerned to see uniformed law enforcement who did not have agency insignia or names displayed on their uniforms during the protests in Washington, D.C., and elsewhere.

I believe, like many Americans, that transparency and accountability for law enforcement are important values of the American justice system.

Based on the recent protests, Ms. HOULAHAN came up with an amendment that I had some concerns about during the debate. She agreed in good faith to modify that to address those concerns.

You see, my oldest son is a police officer. He had to conduct police work both in uniform one day and undercover the second day in the crowd, ensuring that things did not get out of control. I talked to Ms. HOULAHAN about that. I said we need to protect those people, because it is valid law enforcement to have undercover officers. This language did that.

This language, in fact, addresses that and assures, if you are in uniform, if you are carrying a shield, if you are out there, you must identify what agency you are with and your name. Americans expect that.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I will say to the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, no one is asking about identifying antifa. We are asking about identifying people we expect to protect all of us and to conduct themselves in the appropriate manner in law enforcement. To do that, they must identify themselves, and we must know who they are. Anything short of that is not effective police work, and my son would tell you that if he were here today.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY), I would just point out they are Federal law enforcement officials protecting Federal property in Portland, and they do identify themselves when they arrest someone, and they have identification on both shoulders. What else do you want them to do?

If you come in in a marked car, you are going to get a brick through your window. Holy cow. They are behaving exactly the way anyone with common sense would and consistent with the rule of law that you would want them to behave in the situation they find themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This amendment is a remedy that has no current or no historical problems. It is a remedy in search of a solution. We debated this in the Armed Services Committee.

This goes a step further. It defines what Federal law enforcement is, in direct opposition of what is already defined by the Department of Justice.

There is a place and time for this debate, but it is not today. It is not well thought out enough. It doesn't cover local and State officials under the Insurrection Act, like Mr. MITCHELL's son probably, unless he is a Federal law enforcement officer. It doesn't cover Federal employees.

It is just not well thought out, and right now, this is not a problem that needs to be addressed. There are more important issues that we have right now than what we think the President might do.

Don't get me wrong. We had the same debate last year when there was no talk of the Insurrection Act by the President. This is just a way to shut down what our National Guard and what our Presidential authorities are because we don't like this President.

Well, guess what. It applies to all Presidents, all those in the future.

This is bad law, and it is a knee-jerk reaction to a problem that does not exist.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, let me respond to, actually, the ranking member of the committee I serve on.

This is not about whether we identify the vehicle that law enforcement pulls up in; in fact, they often use unmarked vehicles. But when those law enforcement personnel climb out of the vehicle, we should identify who they are, what agency they are with.

In fact, they should announce themselves, because that is what law enforcement does; not come out without identity, without who they are, what their jurisdiction is, be that in Washington, D.C., or in Portland, Oregon.

They are not doing that. It is unacceptable. It is unacceptable in America.

This was debated at great length in committee, and this is what many of us agreed to do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize this

just addresses appropriate identification of law enforcement personnel and vote in favor of this amendment.

□ 1945

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I would just add that this is not just about identification, which the law enforcement do identify themselves with the insignia and patch on both shoulders. When they are arresting someone, they tell them what Federal agency they are from. This is also about limiting the President's ability to use the Insurrection Act.

There are two parts to this amendment. Both are bad; both are wrong. Therefore, I would urge a ''no'' vote.

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

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that we need to take action on the appropriate deployment of unmarked and unidentified law enforcement personnel.

While this amendment is narrowly scoped to focus on a specific scenario, the invocation of the Insurrection Act, I hope it helps to drive a conversation about these questions more broadly.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in House Report 116–457.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY OF FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS TO PARTICIPATE IN EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2006a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) in the case of program offered by a proprietary institution of higher education, the institution derives not less than ten percent of such institution's revenues from sources other than Federal educational assistance funds as required under subsection (c).''.

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

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

''(c) LIMITATION ON PARTICIPATION OF PROPRIETARY INSTITUTIONS.—The Secretary of Defense may not approve an educational program offered by a proprietary institution of higher education, and no educational assistance under a Department of Defense educational assistance program or authority covered by this section may be provided to such an institution, unless the institution derives not less than ten percent of such institution's revenues from sources other than Federal educational assistance funds.'';

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(3) The term 'Federal educational assistance funds' means any Federal funds provided under this title, the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), or any other Federal law, through a grant, contract, subsidy, loan, guarantee, insurance, or other means to a proprietary institution of higher education, including Federal financial assistance that is disbursed or delivered to an institution or on behalf of a student or to a student to be used to attend the institution, except that such term shall not include any monthly housing stipend provided under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program under chapter 33 of title 38.

''(4) The term 'proprietary institution of higher education' has the meaning given that term in section 102(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(b)).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, if there was a loophole in Federal law that led to a waste of taxpayer dollars and abuse of servicemembers and veterans, most of my colleagues would immediately spring into action to close that loophole and prevent waste, fraud, abuse, and the exploitation of our fellow Americans.

Well, that is exactly what for-profit schools are doing right now by exploiting a loophole in the law that caps the amount of Federal revenue that schools can receive. This loophole, known as the 90/10 loophole, excludes GI Bill and DOD tuition assistance benefits from the statutory limits on Federal revenue sources a for-profit school can claim.

Because of this, for-profits have used predatory tactics to aggressively recruit servicemembers and veterans, stealing their benefits and making millions in profit while providing them with low-quality education.

I have heard countless stories of this exploitation as chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Make no mistake, I will be taking decisive action to close this loophole for GI Bill benefits recipients. But first, closing this loophole for the DOD tuition assistance program is an important step to rid these Federal programs of this perverse incentive.

The DOD tuition assistance program, which pays up to $4,500 per year, has allowed servicemembers to pursue higher education at a reduced rate. Military education programs are extremely popular and have played an important role in educating millions of servicemembers.

In fiscal year 2017, over 255,000 servicemembers received nearly half a billion dollars in tuition assistance funding. However, because of the 90/10 loophole, many of our servicemembers have been aggressively targeted by for-profit schools looking to make up the difference in their funding. This loophole has incentivized predatory institutions to continuously deploy deceptive recruiting and marketing tactics to collect as much GI Bill and tuition assistance funding as possible.

So far, it has been lucrative. For every military student they can enroll, they can enroll nine more Title IV students in their low-performing programs.

This is not the free market at work. The fundamental basis of the 90/10 rule was to demonstrate that a real market exists for these educational programs and validate the quality and cost of these programs. This loophole lets these predatory schools cheat the free market and the government by collecting up to 100 percent of their revenue from Federal dollars.

This is a bipartisan issue and a bipartisan amendment. I ask that my colleagues stand up for our servicemembers and protect taxpayer dollars from predatory for-profit institutions that only view them as a benefit to their bottom line.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment under consideration seeks to punish a small business because it had the audacity to try to help military and veteran students achieve their educational and career potential.

The amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to deny proprietary colleges and universities permission to operate the DOD educational assistance programs if such an institution of higher ed receives more than 90 percent of its revenue from ''Federal education assistance funds.'' Federal education assistance funds include DOD tuition assistance, GI Bill benefits, and all Federal student aid in the Higher Education Act, like Pell Grants and student loans.

Congress should not deny educational choices to military servicemembers because of arbitrary accounting gimmicks based on the whims of Congress. Sadly, that is exactly what this amendment would do if passed and implemented.

What is particularly damaging about the amendment is it seeks to judge institutions on how students pay for

school and not on the success of the students. This is not what good, fair accountability looks like.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in accountability for all institutions, no matter their tax status. If this accountability framework is so great for students, then my colleagues should not mind applying the accounting standard to all institutions.

But that is not what this is about. This is about putting hardworking Americans out of business. Students are an afterthought in Democrats' zeal to eliminate for-profit colleges.

My colleagues would like you to believe that for-profit colleges act only to pad their bottom lines at the expense of students. This belief comes from a fundamental misunderstanding about the goals and aims of a business.

Any successful small business owner can tell you that cutting corners and delivering an inferior product to customers in the hopes of making a bit more money will only result in fewer customers and less business.

The profit motive, in fact, is a powerful incentive for proprietary colleges to act in the best short- and long-term interests of students. That is why you see several for-profit institutions spending all the money received from the CARES Act on direct student aid. Without a reputation for delivering successful results, these colleges would cease to exist.

Additionally, this amendment has the perverse incentive of forcing colleges to increase their tuition, thereby shutting out opportunities for students who might be unable to afford these increases.

We should not be putting forward additional harmful regulations that cause college costs to increase. Instead, we should be looking to provide incentives to decrease costs while also judging all institutions based on how they improve the lives of the students they serve.

I urge all Members to reject the inclusion of this amendment. Vote ''no.''

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on my side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are 2 minutes remaining on each side.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman TAKANO for yielding and for his leadership, along with Representative LEE, on this issue.

If only it were true that no servicemembers or no veterans were taken advantage of, were never put into a junk program by one of these organizations. If only that were true. But we know it is not, and this legislation intends to address that.

The GI Bill loophole is real. It has incentivized for-profit colleges to aggressively target veterans into these junk programs. Not all, but any organization that can't stand up a program without relying 100 percent on the funding that we provide has to face some scrutiny.

This is a rule that has worked, and it is a rule that ought to be extended to protect those people who have made the most significant sacrifice that Americans can make by putting on the uniform of their country and serving us. They deserve no less.

This amendment would come to their aid, and I support it. I commend my colleagues for offering it.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE), one of my committee members on the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I stand with Congressman TAKANO in support of this amendment to close the 90/10 loophole for the Department of Defense military education benefits.

Educational institutions are required to derive at least 10 percent of their revenues from non-Federal sources. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that schools offer an education that is of high enough value and high enough quality that people would actually want to use their own money to pay for it.

It is about proving market viability, which is supposed to guarantee that taxpayers will not support low-quality schools. If they can't compete in the open market, they should not be supported entirely by the government.

This loophole, which effectively treats Defense Department money as the same as what is supposed to come out of people's pockets, violates the safeguards we intended to have in place. That is why it is called a loophole. And it explains why certain untrustworthy colleges, many of which are for-profit, target servicemembers and veterans.

Closing this loophole is a concrete step to ensuring we protect our servicemembers.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. The gentleman from California has no time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have heard from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that for-profit institutions, proprietary schools, are taking advantage of veterans, in particular. The bottom line is this amendment is arbitrary and is not a meaningful accountability tool.

Let me point out that the University of Maryland University College, which recently changed its name—I hear it advertising every morning on the radio—actively recruits and enrolls many, many veterans, a very high percentage of veterans, and is a university supported by the taxpayers of Maryland, along with Federal taxpayers.

□ 2000

But it has for many, many years had a graduation rate less than 10 percent. I don't hear my colleagues talking about, again, other institutions which have abysmal graduation rates and serve many veterans being held to the same accountability measures. This is not fair.

We hear a lot about fairness from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Let's be fair. Let's apply the rules to everyone—everyone—Mr. Speaker.

Our students, particularly the brave men and women in uniform, deserve better from us no matter where they might choose to continue their education. So let's be fair. Let's make the rules the same for everyone. Let's not go after institutions that have been in existence, some for hundreds of years, because our colleagues don't like groups of people that make a profit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

The question is on the amendment.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 143 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 167 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 167 printed in House Report 116–457.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer amendment No. 167 as the designee of Mr. HASTINGS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12___. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE OPEN SKIES TREATY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the decision to withdraw from the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002—

(A) did not comply with the requirement in section 1234(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (133 Stat. 1648; 22 U.S.C. 2593a note) to notify Congress not fewer than 120 days prior to any such announcement;

(B) was made without asserting material breach of the Treaty by any other Treaty signatory; and

(C) was made over the objections of NATO allies and regional partners;

(2) confidence and security building measures that are designed to reduce the risk of conflict, increase trust among participating countries, and contribute to military transparency remain vital to the strategic interests of our NATO allies and partners and should continue to play a central role as the United States engages in the region to promote transatlantic security; and

(3) while the United States must always consider the national security benefits of remaining in any treaty, responding to Russian violations of treaty protocols should be prioritized through international engagement and robust diplomatic action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, in 1955, President Eisenhower proposed an agreement which would allow overflight of the participant countries to gather information about military forces and activities with the direct intent of minimizing military escalation between the West and Russia.

In 1992, Eisenhower's vision was realized after negotiations by a Republican administration that led to the Open Skies Treaty, a treaty which has brought more openness but also more mutual understanding and an avenue to hold Russia accountable for their aggression against our allies in Europe. But, more importantly, the Open Skies Treaty calls for higher levels of openness and transparency, leading to better predictability and stability, which, ultimately, will lessen tensions by trusting and, yes, by verifying.

Unfortunately, on May 22, the administration submitted a notice of intent that the U.S. would withdraw from the treaty in violation of the fiscal year 2020 NDAA, which requires a 120-day notice to Congress prior to doing so.

This announcement was obviously met with strong opposition from our NATO allies and treaty participants and, yes, many here in the United States, for no country adherent has benefited more from this transparency than the United States, which, together with its allies, overflies Russia far more often than Russia can overfly NATO countries.

There is no better example of this benefit of the Open Skies Treaty than the support it has provided to Ukraine, both in 2014, when it was used to confirm that Russia had deployed thousands of troops near the Ukrainian-Russian border, and again in December 2018, when an extraordinary flight was conducted following the unprovoked Russian attack of Ukrainian vessels in the Kerch Strait.

Now, we cannot ignore Russian violations of the treaty, but, one, they do not negate the value of the treaty and certainly do not justify withdrawal. Instead, the administration should do what was required in previous NDAAs: put together a plan for broad sanctions tied to these violations and continue to use diplomatic means together with our allies to pressure Russia into compliance.

Walking away from this 34-nation treaty will negatively impact our relationships in Europe, give Russia a gift in creating discord amongst our partners in the region, and vacate a key U.S. leadership role in countering Russian malign activities.

The worth of this treaty does not necessarily come in the form of the images that are captured but, instead, the value it brings to our alliances, particularly with our Eastern European partners and friends. It was stated by former Secretary Mattis: ''Despite Russia's violations of its obligations under the treaty, it is my view that it is in our Nation's best interest to remain a party to the Open Skies Treaty.''

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, would provide a sense of Congress about the importance of this treaty, the value it brings to our allies, and express that the notice of intent to withdraw was done in violation of the law.

That is why I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate that the advocate to the amendment slipped into his comments that Russia cheats, because that is why we are stepping out.

Mr. Speaker, you can't have a treaty with just yourself. You have to have a treaty with two parties or more, and those parties have to comply or you really don't have a treaty.

Unfortunately, though, the gentleman went on to state that no one benefits more than the United States. It is just absolutely not true. Very publicly, we have held hearings on this in my subcommittee. The intelligence community and the DOD have openly stated that the information that we receive from Open Skies is duplicative and is even inferior to the other sources of information we have.

With respect to our allies, we don't kill this treaty by stepping out. They can stay in. If they want to do flyovers, they can do their own flyovers. The thing that we are not going to do is do the flyovers for them and then hand them the information.

But what is really important about the ''yeah, Russia cheats'' is let's talk about how Russia cheats.

Trust but verify? You can't verify if they cheat. The Kaliningrad in Europe is one of the places where Russia hosts missiles that hold all of our allies and the United States at risk. Russia limits overflights, and then Russia does a really neat trick like they invade Georgia. They declare the areas that they invade as totally new countries and then say that we can't overfly what they are doing in these areas that they occupy of our ally Georgia.

It is incredibly important that we step out of this treaty. They are not complying. It does not provide benefit to us.

The other aspect that I think probably should be the most concerning to every American listening to this, in our hearings in our committee, the DOD absolutely states that Russia incorrectly uses this information to target assets in the United States—target, that is right, to bomb the United States—which is completely a violation of the treaty.

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Congressman PANETTA and Congressman HASTINGS for their leadership and their work on this issue in bringing this amendment to the floor.

When President Trump came into office, Mr. Speaker, he turned allies into adversaries and autocrats into accomplices. He saw friendship and loyalty as weakness and saw dictators as his new best friend. That has led to American foreign policy that is now in shambles. It has rendered American leadership meaningless in parts of the world and has left a vacuum that continues to be exploited by nations like Russia and China. It has torn treaties that reinforced global peace to shreds.

One of those, the Open Skies Treaty, has ingrained transparency and accountability around the world. For nearly two decades, it has strengthened peace across the United States, Europe, and Russia. Now our President has tried to reduce the hard work of fostering that peace to shambles. Even as he follows those dictators into unrest and potential violence, we will not follow, and certainly no Americans yearning for peace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to protect peace and to vote for this amendment.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY).

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I think this amendment actually highlights the hypocrisy at the heart of the foreign policy and national security policy our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say they advocate.

This is a situation in which the President has said that Russia is cheating and, therefore, I will not allow Russia to cheat. I will not allow the United States to continue to be party to a treaty that enables Russia to gather information about us in violation of the treaty.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle consistently say and accuse the President of not being tough enough on Russia, but here we have a situation where the President is doing exactly that. The United States senior counterintelligence official, Bill Evanina, recently has said that Russia

has, for years, ''used the Open Skies Treaty to collect intelligence on civilian infrastructure and other sensitive sites in America.''

The Kremlin has been abusing this treaty to gather intelligence on the United States. The President was absolutely right to withdraw, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to be consistent. If they say that they stand on principle, then they need to be consistent about that principle and not simply oppose things because Trump supports them. The President was right to get out of this treaty. It is dangerous to our security.

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the Trump administration has withdrawn from historic international treaties and agreements that previous leaders of our country have negotiated where, instead of walking away from what were deemed impossible agreements at that time, they actually did the work necessary to make our country and the world a safer place.

The Open Skies Treaty was negotiated by President George H.W. Bush to reduce the chances of accidental nuclear war by providing transparency and confidence. President Trump's withdrawal from the Open Skies Treaty has made our world a less safe place. In addition to his withdrawal from the INF treaty and his failure to renew the START treaty, he has pushed us into a new cold war that has led the American people to the brink of nuclear catastrophe.

Mr. Speaker, these consequences are unacceptable for the American people, and I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, we have before us, the National Defense Authorization Act that is proceeding as a bipartisan bill. Chairman SMITH committed himself to that, and Ranking Member THORNBERRY worked diligently to make this a bipartisan bill. So you only see the differences, as Congresswoman CHENEY was saying, when you come to these amendments.

What is unfortunate about the differences between this side and that side of the aisle is amendment after amendment has been paraded on the other side of the aisle that want to disarm the United States, restrain our weapons programs, and shackle us to treaties where the other side cheats. I would have loved to have stood here while the time for this amendment was spent to implore Russia to stop cheating and to implore Russia to come to the table and begin to comply with the treaties that they have undertaken.

I would love for the time when there were discussions of amendments on the other side to shackle our nuclear weapons programs to instead point out that China is launching more ballistic missiles for testing and training than the entire rest of the world combined.

I would have loved for the speakers on the other side of the aisle to march down to the microphone and tell this country about Skyfall, the new weapon ICBM that Russia is putting together that is nuclear powered that can orbit the planet before it comes down and does its devastation.

I would have loved for our adversaries to be the target of the words from the other side and not our own programs to defend our Nation.

It is absolutely essential that we not stay in treaties that are negative to the United States and where our adversaries are not complying.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2015

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider an amendment en bloc consisting of amendments printed in House Report 116–457.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1053, I offer amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, and 406 printed in House Report 116–457, offered by Mr. SMITH of Washington:

AMENDMENT NO. 168 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle B of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3___. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING AN INTEGRATED MASTER PLAN TOWARDS ACHIEVING NET ZERO.

It is the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should develop an integrated master plan for pursuing Net Zero initiatives and reductions in fossil fuels using the findings of—

(1) the assessment of Department of Defense operational energy usage required under section 318;

(2) the Comptroller General report on Department of Defnse installation energy required under section 323; and

(3) the Department of Defense report on emissions required under section 324.

AMENDMENT NO. 169 OFFERED BY MRS. HAYES OF CONNECTICUT

At the end of subtitle E of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2___. FUNDING FOR AIR FORCE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, basic research, university research initiatives (PE 0601103F), line 002 is hereby increased by $5,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for operation and maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for operation and maintenance, Army, admin & servicewide activities, servicewide communications, line 440 is hereby reduced by $5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 170 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle E of title XVII, insert the following:

SEC. 17__. SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL MARITIME HERITAGE GRANTS PROGRAM.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense may contribute $5,000,000 to support the National Maritime Heritage Grants Program established under section 308703 of title 54, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 171 OFFERED BY MR. HILL OF ARKANSAS

Page 1115, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1762. EXTENSION OF TIME TO REVIEW WORLD WAR I VALOR MEDALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 584(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (Public Law 116–92; 133 Stat. 1281) is amended by striking ''five'' and inserting ''seven''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (Public Law 116–92; 133 Stat. 1281).

AMENDMENT NO. 172 OFFERED BY MR. HILL OF ARKANSAS

Page 1115, after line 5, insert the following:

SEC. 1762. ENSURING CHINESE DEBT TRANSPARENCY.

(a) UNITED STATES POLICY AT THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(2) of the International Financial Institutions Act) that it