



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 17, 2018

No. 81

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC

May 17, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SCOTT DESJARLAIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

RECOGNIZING DYLAN RHEKER AS MACOMB COUNTY VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize recently named Macomb County Volunteer of the Year, eighth-grader Dylan Rheker.

Dylan, age 14, volunteers at the Village of East Harbor senior living facility, at Francis A. Higgins Elementary School, at the Anna Mae Burdi Early Childhood Center, as well as Selfridge

Air National Guard Base and the Roseville Community Schools.

However, what is also impressive, in addition to Dylan's giving spirit, is his perseverance. You see, Dylan was born with neurofibromatosis, a condition which causes tumors to form in his brain, spinal cord, and nerves. Dylan was also diagnosed with cancer and has been undergoing chemotherapy for the past 4 years.

None of this deters the straight-A student as he helps people across the 10th Congressional District. In fact, Dylan recently set a school volunteer hour record, with 236 hours of volunteer service last year. When asked about his volunteerism, Dylan responds that he is "happy to help" and "always here if someone needs help."

Dylan is an outstanding young man, and I am extremely proud of all the work he does in our district to make the community a better place to live and work. I wish him the best of luck in the future, and I hope all of you will as well.

RECOGNIZING CARLA VILLALVAZO AS WINNER OF 2018 CONGRESSIONAL ART COMPETITION

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Carla Villalvazo, a high school student from Eisenhower High School in Shelby Township, Michigan. Carla is the winner of the 2018 Congressional Art Competition for my district. Her artwork titled "Forget Me Not" is a watercolor painting which will hang in the Cannon tunnel of the Capitol for the next year.

Importantly, it is not only wonderful artwork, it talks about the struggle the family has with a family member with Alzheimer's. It is great artwork, but it also touches my heart and, I think, many others.

I also recognize second-place finisher Stefanie Frontera, also from Eisenhower High School, and third-place finisher Christina Berels from Cardinal Mooney High School. These students all submitted wonderful pieces of art.

The second- and third-place winners will hang in my office.

I thank them all for their submission.

UNDERMINING OF OUR DEMOCRACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, Russia has been working to undermine our democracy, as well as democracies throughout Europe, including Central and Eastern Europe.

Unfortunately, too many Americans and elected officials have been distracted from Russia's secret operations because of the pitched, partisan battle regarding Putin's involvement in the 2016 Presidential race.

The bottom line is this: Democrats and Republicans can't lose focus on Russia's worldwide treachery due to our hyperpartisanship here at home.

Instead, Democrats and Republicans in Congress must work together to expose Russia's worldwide plan to subvert democracy. We must face the reality that Russia is a strategic competitor of the United States that is using nontraditional, nonmilitary weapons in a hybrid warfare to undermine democracies in countries that are ill-equipped to combat their malign efforts.

Instead of focusing on Russia's activities during the 2016 election, I have introduced a bipartisan bill, the Russia Anti-Corruption Act, with 13 Republicans and 10 Democratic cosponsors, to expose and thwart Putin and his cronies' illicit activities in Eastern Europe and Europe as a whole.

Whether bribing politicians, cyber attacks, manipulating social media networks, buying media outlets to promote propaganda, or purchasing power plants to control energy supplies to gain leverage over unstable governments, we must define, document, and

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H4141

disrupt the corruption flowing from Moscow, which imperils the democratic foundations of our U.S. allies.

Our legislation would establish within the State Department an office of anticorruption relating to illicit Russian financial activities in Europe which would analyze Russia's financial meddling in strategic European sectors, including real estate, energy, media, and infrastructure.

The office will collaborate with the Treasury Department to train U.S. diplomats to work with foreign partners to uncover and prosecute illegal Russian financial activity. This office will also work with our NATO allies to elevate anticorruption operations as part of NATO's readiness action plan.

Oligarchs connected to Vladimir Putin are malevolent allies in the Russian President's hybrid warfare scheme. They flood Europe with dirty money, bribing politicians and purchasing key assets to subvert democracy. The Panama Papers found a trail of \$2 billion that leads back to the Russian President. Such money has gone to support fringe political parties in France, Germany, Austria, and elsewhere.

Well-funded Russian media outlets also play a key role in this hybrid warfare. They spread lies and weaken faith in European governments. Our allies in Central and Eastern Europe have accused Russia of a campaign of bribery meant to undermine the transatlantic alliance.

All of this, of course, complements Russia's more overt tactics, from its military aggression in the Ukraine to its campaign of assassinations on European soil. As Putin and his cronies work to discredit open societies, the dark and dangerous sphere of Moscow's influence grows and grows and grows. That is how democracies can die.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about President Trump, and it is not about Democrats versus Republicans. Members of Congress must work together to find solutions to the very serious threats posed by Russia the world over.

I now yield to my friend and colleague, Mr. FRENCH HILL, the original cosponsor of the Russia Anti-Corruption Act and a real leader on this critical issue.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York for yielding and compliment him for his leadership on this topic.

Just like rebuilding our transatlantic relationship on NATO and our partners for military work and just like our work in exporting energy now, natural gas and oil, to Europe to offset the Russian dominance, this work, this political work, is essential. I thank my friend from New York, and I was proud to be an original cosponsor on this legislation.

I want to tell you, on a recent visit in the last few months I had to Krakow, Poland, I was with the Kosciuszko Institute there in Krakow, which has studied Russian cyber attacks throughout Central Europe extensively.

They were telling all of us that they are the front line of propaganda, cyber attack, testing and training for what we have seen in the United States and around the world.

The institute cited Estonia in 2007, Georgia in 2008, the Ukraine in 2011, and the 2013 Energetic Bear attack as well-known public examples of how Russia is using Central Europe to perfect their strategies before deploying to other Western countries, including what we witnessed here in the United States.

By the Congress addressing and passing Mr. SUOZZI's bill, we can help Europeans on the front lines of the fight against the Russian corruption, propaganda, and cyber intrusion machine.

I thank my friend for the time he so generously gave to me.

HONORING LIEUTENANT AARON CROOK OF THE BLUEFIELD POLICE DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation honors National Police Week, I rise today to remember a fallen officer, Lieutenant Aaron Crook of the Bluefield Police Department.

This week, the name of Officer Crook, along with 359 of his fallen brothers and sisters in blue, will be added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial here in Washington. As our Nation honors our police officers for their sacrifices, we give thanks to the life of Officer Crook, whom we sadly lost last May.

Lieutenant Crook was born in Summers County, graduated from Bluefield State College, and proudly served in the United States Marine Corps Reserve for 6 years. After serving his Nation, he exchanged his Marine uniform for that of the Bluefield Police Department in 2008.

Lieutenant Crook was an outstanding police officer and devoted family man. He loved the outdoors and would never pass up an opportunity to go fishing. In fact, the city of Bluefield is planning to rename a lake in his honor so his legacy can carry on through one of his favorite pastimes.

His memory is kept alive by his wife, Whitney; his kids, Brycen and Paislee; his extended family; the Bluefield Police Department; and so many others.

He will never be forgotten. Our State and country lost a good man, and Officer Crook is missed each and every day. May he rest in peace.

MEMORIALIZING OFFICERS LOST IN THE LINE OF DUTY

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to speak on the House floor today in

recognition of National Police Week and to memorialize the officers lost in the line of duty.

For me and for the communities that I represent, it is personal. Just 2 years ago, Officers Lesley Zerebny and Gil Vega from the Palm Springs Police Department were shot and killed in the line of duty, responding to what appeared to be a routine domestic disturbance.

In the wake of this tragedy, our communities came together to remember Officers Zerebny and Vega and to do more for the entire law enforcement community.

Over the past year, I have worked with law enforcement, firefighters, and other local and national public safety officer leaders to draft the Heroes Lesley Zerebny and Gil Vega First Responder Survivors Support Act, legislation that honors those who have passed by serving the living.

We developed this bill with one central idea in mind: that those who risk their lives for our community deserve the peace of mind to know that if something happened to them their family would be okay—that they would be able to pay off their debt, put their kids through college, and have a fair shot of making it in the world.

So we did the math, looking at the existing Public Safety Officer Benefit Program to see if it achieved these principles, and we found that families of fallen first responders, those who gave their all to protect us, are being shortchanged and don't even have enough to pay off their debt and pay for the rising cost of an education.

Families of fallen public safety officers are still struggling. My bipartisan bill will correct this and provide needed relief for those who sacrifice so much. It will increase the Public Safety Officer Benefit from \$350,000 to \$500,000 in order to pay off the calculated national average debt most families have. It will increase the monthly education benefit from \$1,024 per month to \$2,000 per month to ensure they can afford the actual rising cost of an education. And it will fix a bureaucratic loophole that costs families tens of thousands of dollars for no fault of their own.

Right now, our men and women who risk their lives in order to save our lives are being shortchanged. I urge all Members of Congress to do the right thing, to follow words with action and actually do something pragmatic that will improve the lives of fallen first responders' families.

I hope that all Members will cosponsor and support my bipartisan Heroes Lesley Zerebny and Gil Vega First Responder Survivors Support Act, and I urge the Speaker to bring it up for a vote immediately. Let's support this bill and stand up for these families that have sacrificed so much for us.

□ 1015

HONORING CHRISTOPHER'S CLUBHOUSE

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to honor an incredible organization in my

district that, for more than a decade, has served the community by providing information and resources to help children, the elderly, and vulnerable individuals protect themselves from violent crimes.

Christopher's Clubhouse was started in 1996 after Mika Moulton's son, Christopher, was kidnapped and murdered at 10 years old. The family made the brave and selfless choice to turn their grief into something positive. They realized that, while they had done everything right like telling Christopher not to talk to strangers, no one had told them that there was more that they could have done. They realized that they had not taught him what to do if someone had grabbed Christopher.

They didn't want any parent to face that same realization and that same grief, so they started Christopher's Clubhouse to provide safety skills and personal defense techniques for children, teens, and the elderly throughout the Coachella Valley.

Over the years, Christopher's Clubhouse has served more than 100,000 people through their programs in schools, community events, and churches. There is no doubt that they have made a difference and saved lives, preventing other parents from going through their pain.

I thank them and I applaud them for their years of service. While Christopher's Clubhouse may be closing, the legacy of their work will be felt for generations.

HONORING THE MEMORY AND SACRIFICE OF NEW YORK CITY POLICE OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory and sacrifice of New York police officers killed in the line of duty.

Every day, women and men don blue uniforms and head out to the streets, unsure of what danger they may encounter. They protect my family and the 8 million people who live in New York City. I thank them for risking everything to keep us safe.

The following men and women, New York's finest, have met their end of watch while carrying out their duties since I came to office in Congress in May of 2015. I would like to honor them by reading their names here in the House Chamber:

Lieutenant Jeffrey Francis, 9/11-related illness

Detective Miosotis Familia, gunfire
Officer Michael Hance, 9/11-related illness

Sergeant Terrence Scott O'Hara, 9/11-related illness

Deputy Chief James Molloy, 9/11-related illness

Detective Steven McDonald, gunfire
Detective Stephen Kubinski, 9/11-related illness

Sergeant Paul Tuozzolo, gunfire

Assistant Chief Michael Quinn, 9/11-related illness

Detective Michael Glazer, 9/11-related illness

Lieutenant Kenneth Rosello, 9/11-related illness

Officer Kenneth Wolf, 9/11-related illness

Officer Deborah Garbutt-Jeff, 9/11-related illness

Detective Andrew Siroka, 9/11-related illness

Officer Juan Feliciano, heart attack
Sergeant Donald Scott Conniff, vehicular assault

Sergeant Michael Galvin, 9/11-related illness

Sergeant Wayne Jackson, 9/11-related illness

Lieutenant Marci Simms, 9/11-related illness

Officer Charles Karen, 9/11-related illness

Sergeant Louis Pioli, 9/11-related illness

Detective Randolph Holder, gunfire
Sergeant Gerard Beyrodt, 9/11-related illness

Detective Ronald Richards, 9/11-related illness

Sergeant Edmund Murray, 9/11-related illness

Lieutenant Rebecca Buck, 9/11-related illness

Officer Alexander Figueroa, 9/11-related illness

Lieutenant Luis Lopez, 9/11-related illness

Officer Matthew Gay, 9/11-related illness

Officer James Betso, 9/11-related illness

Detective Leroy Dixon, 9/11-related illness

Detective Michael Kenneth Davis, 9/11-related illness

Sergeant Charles Gunzelman, 9/11-related illness.

May their families continue to be in our prayers.

AMERICA NEEDS A COORDINATED 21ST CENTURY NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is Infrastructure Week. You can tell from all of the activity across the country: all of the rebuilding of the 140,000 bridges that need repair or replacement; the 40 percent of the national highway system that has failed to the point where we have to rebuild the whole thing, not just resurface it; and the \$100 billion backlog in transit. It is all—well, actually, none of that is happening.

In fact, despite the President being right here and talking about a \$1.5 trillion plan—wow, a big surprise, up by \$500 billion—during the State of the Union, the net result of what this President and this administration have done is actually to reduce spending on infrastructure and put forward a paper

plan that would say you are on your own.

It is called devolution; that is, we are going to say to the States and the territories: It is your obligation to build a national coordinated transportation infrastructure.

This is a grand new idea from some of the rightwing think tanks: Make the States do it.

How is that going to work?

Well, actually, it is not a new idea. We tried it once before. Actually, we tried it by default until we had the Eisenhower plan, a Republican President, to build a national highway system.

This was the net result of devolution: Kansas, Oklahoma; you build it, we will build it.

Well, Kansas built it.

What is this?

Oh, that is the State line.

This is Oklahoma: Sorry, we don't have the money to build and continue that beautiful new freeway—1956.

For 3 years, cars crashed through a wooden barrier they built at the end at the State line into Amos Sweitzer's farm field until we had a national transportation plan, from a Republican President, funded by a user fee, a gas tax, to build out the system nationwide.

And then it was Ronald Reagan who said: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. We can't just have highways. We need to have transit to serve our Nation's largest cities and our hubs.

So we added transit into this.

That is all well and good. We built a system that was the envy of the world 40 years ago, 30 years ago, maybe even 25 years ago. Since then, it has been crumbling with neglect.

We haven't raised the Federal gas tax since 1993: 140,000 bridges need repair or replacement; \$100 billion backlog in transit, just to build out to a state of good repair for what we have and not even give people new transit options to get out of the congestion and the traffic.

We are wasting billions of dollars a year, wasting fuel from people sitting in gridlock all around the country. They are damaging their cars through potholes, and they don't have the transit options that were promised to them.

So what is going on? Well, it seems like the Republicans love to talk about it. Oh, they just love to talk about infrastructure. Everybody loves to talk about it—we are going to fill those potholes; we are going to build those bridges; we are going to take care of you—but they refuse to fund it. That is the bottom line.

We need to fund an ambitious new national infrastructure plan: transit, roads, bridges, highways, harbors and ports, wastewater, clean water, and the list goes on and on and on.

You can't be a great nation if your people are mired in gridlock, if your roads are potholed, if your harbors are silted in, if your jetties are failing, if your wastewater systems are 50 years

old and can't take any new capacity and actually are polluting our rivers, and clean water is not available to people in some of the largest cities in the United States of America.

Where is the Federal partner? There is no Federal partner with the Republicans in charge. Let the States do it. Let's devolve this obligation to the States. That is their solution: The States should pay for it.

Well, it didn't work in the fifties. How the heck is that going to work in the 21st century?

Even if one State decides now to increase capacity to move freight—say California wants to move all of the freight that comes into Los Angeles out of California to the rest of the Nation where it is going and bring the goods in to export from there, how is that going to work when you get to the Nevada State line and there is a two-lane road—or no road—on the other side?

This is an abject failure, and it is time for Congress to act. If the Republicans won't act, maybe we need to replace them with a party that will act to rebuild America and make us competitive in the world for the 21st century, not devolution. We need a Federal partnership. We need Federal investment. We need a coordinated 21st century national transportation system.

RECOGNIZING REBECCA OBERT-THORN

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize an educator in my district who is making a lasting difference in the lives of Bucks County students.

Rebecca Obert-Thorn, of Pennwood Middle School in Lower Makefield, was recently named the winner of the Axalta All-Pro Teacher of the Year Award. For this distinction, Rebecca has secured \$7,000 for Pennwood to be used on materials that promote STEM education and opportunities for students.

This program, which is in collaboration with the Philadelphia Eagles, honored Rebecca due to her dedication in the classroom, along with her work on the board of directors at Silver Lake Nature Center in Bristol and through STEM work at the Bucks County Community College. It also featured an event at Pennwood Middle School with Eagles wide receiver Bryce Treggs.

I applaud Rebecca for her work in promoting STEM education and her commitment to building our next generation of leaders in Bucks County.

RECOGNIZING COUNCIL ROCK HIGH SCHOOL SOUTH

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, NASA is known for hiring the brightest and most adept people in the world to execute the functions of space exploration and research. I am proud to rec-

ognize some of their youngest employees, who work not out of Houston, Texas, but from Council Rock High School South in Pennsylvania.

Council Rock South is one of 125 schools in the Nation, and the only school in Pennsylvania, that participate in a unique program that enables students to develop projects that ultimately could be used by NASA itself. Indeed, NASA is currently working on one of the projects that originated from Council Rock South several years prior: a vibration isolation chamber that would protect fertilized eggs.

I applaud these students for their contributions and would like to thank the technology education teacher, Fred Bauer, for the guidance and direction he provides these impressive young women and men.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about something critical to each and every person in the House and the millions of Americans whom we represent: our health.

It is no secret that the Affordable Care Act was an important start toward increasing access to care and addressing long-lingering health disparities that plague our communities. Thanks to the ACA, millions of Americans have access to quality, affordable healthcare, many for the first time. The impacts have been positive across the country, but especially in the African American community, where the uninsured rate has been cut in half.

Mr. Speaker, this is remarkable progress, but we still have a long way to go. Globally, the U.S. ranks 24th in healthcare. Let me say that again. We, the United States, the richest country in the history of the world, ranks 24th when it comes to healthcare. Nations like Slovenia, Antigua, and Barbuda outrank us. Mr. Speaker, that is outrageous. We can and must do better.

One area we desperately need to do better in is mental health. One in five Americans—that is more than 40 million of us—suffer from a mental health condition. Thankfully, the Affordable Care Act mandated, for the first time, that mental health services be included in coverage.

But stigma and a persistent lack of access to care continue to prevent many from seeking and receiving treatment. It is estimated that more than half of those struggling with a mental health condition cannot, or do not, receive the care that they need.

This Mental Health Awareness Month, I want to challenge my colleagues to join efforts to end stigma and bring these issues out into the open: join a rally, send a tweet on available services in your district, or host a roundtable with veterans who are struggling.

□ 1030

Do something, anything, to help deconstruct the stigma.

If every Member of this House did something, that is more than 440 moments to help tear down this stigma that keeps too many struggling without care.

This month, May, is also Lupus Awareness Month. Despite affecting more than 1.5 million Americans, lupus is poorly understood and often overlooked even by medical professionals.

It is estimated that a patient with lupus will go 6 years before they finally receive an accurate diagnosis.

More than 90 percent of those living with lupus are women, and a disproportionate number are people of color. In fact, African Americans, Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans are as much as three times more likely to be diagnosed with lupus than White Americans.

I hope that this House will mark May and Lupus Awareness Month by committing research, improved awareness, and increased access to care to support the 1.5 million Americans living with lupus.

This month, I also want to draw attention to the fact that more than 75 million of us suffer from high blood pressure.

Tragically, more than half—or 38 million—of us do not have this condition under control, leading to worsening complications, including heart disease and stroke, two of the leading causes of death in this country.

High blood pressure is often called the silent killer, and I know that nearly every one of us in this House has a story of losing a friend or loved one to stroke or a heart attack.

Again, as with nearly every disease, African Americans are disproportionately impacted. In fact, more than 40 percent of African American women and men have high blood pressure.

Our community often tends to develop this disorder earlier and experience it more severely than our White counterparts.

So this month I challenge everyone to “embrace the squeeze” and get your blood pressure checked. Knowing is half the battle, and it can save your life.

We have a chance for Congress to tackle these issues head-on.

Next week, my dear friend, mentor, and colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, will introduce the Health Equity and Accountability Act, also known as the HEAA bill.

This bill, that I have personally had the honor of introducing last Congress, takes a comprehensive look at where we need to address Americans' health disparities crisis.

I hope that all Members will take a careful look at this important bill and join us as cosponsors.

While many of these health disparities have existed for years, they don't need to persist. We can address them, we can solve problems, so let's get to it.

2018 SECRETARY OF DEFENSE EMPLOYER SUPPORT FREEDOM AWARD

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, in honor of National Police Week, I rise today to recognize the Dunlap, Tennessee, Police Department on its selection as a finalist for the 2018 Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award.

This award, given each year by the National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard, recognizes employers who go above and beyond to support their employees serving in the National Guard and military reserves. Out of 2,300 nominations nationwide, the Dunlap Police Department was chosen as one of just 30 finalists for the award, whose recipients will be announced next month.

Under the leadership of Police Chief Clint Huth, who is himself a Navy Reserve Master Chief, the Dunlap Police Department has been active in their support for their guard and their reserve employees.

Like many employers across the country, Chief Huth and the Dunlap PD play an important role in our Nation's military readiness through their unwavering support of our reserve components.

On behalf of Tennessee's Fourth District, I would like to congratulate them on their recognition and offer my sincere gratitude for the commitment they have made to our citizen soldiers.

THE FARM BILL IS A FLAWED BILL

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the debate this week in Congress centers largely around the farm bill, the most important bill that most people pay little or no attention to.

Currently, there is a mad scramble for votes for a flawed bill from a fractured Republican caucus.

Now, we are going to have some minor discussions on the floor. There are some amendments that will be bounced back and forth, but they are basically beside the point, not the big-picture issues that need to be debated.

There are fatal flaws. First and foremost, virtually everyone on our side of the aisle is adamantly opposed to the efforts to cut nutrition funding through SNAP, food stamps, rather than expanding opportunities to nutrition and healthy food.

For example, they are cutting farmers market funding, for heaven's sake, projects that are popular across the country and connect consumers directly with farmers for fresh, healthy food.

This is all while they are proposing to essentially hound people off food stamps with unnecessary restrictions for employment. The vast majority of people are already employed or have difficulty being employed or there aren't jobs available. They are going to have a job training program, about \$45 per person, which anybody who works in this field will acknowledge that the bureaucracy and the trouble will be more than it is worth in terms of a benefit to people. Essentially, they will hound people off food stamps.

This is at the same time where they are expanding subsidies for wealthy farming interests and expanding the ability to get those subsidies to people who aren't actively involved with farming. This bill is going to send subsidy checks to New York City and Chicago and San Francisco, people who are cousins and nieces and nephews, not actively farming.

The second major problem with this bill is it attacks conservation funding, cutting a billion dollars from essential services, cutbacks with the Conservation Stewardship Program, \$5 billion cut out of the Working Lands Project, and not strengthening the ability of environmental programs to produce results. There is no requirement that we have high-quality environmental outcomes.

In fact, the EQIP Program has a wide variety of things that we pay farmers to do that actually don't enhance the environment. We are paying farmers for the cost of doing business: fencing, hog lagoons. That is decidedly the wrong step to take.

The worst aspect that is not getting the attention it deserves is the so-called King amendment, the Protect Interstate Commerce Act, which would prevent State or local governments from regulating an agricultural product except to the extent it is already regulated by Federal law or the producing State.

Think about that for a moment. States are moving to deal with the opioid crisis, and they would be prevented from having drug prohibitions that go beyond what the Federal Government does or other States.

Food packaging regulations. Many States are concerned about BPA-free container requirements for baby food: prohibited.

Fishing regulations. In my State, and I suspect in many others, people are serious about being able to protect fisheries, commercial and recreational, but under this bill, they would be prohibited if another State has looser requirements. My colleague from Seattle might have some concerns in her State about protecting the clamming operations, but some State like Nebraska that doesn't have them could come in and not observe those limits.

The notion that we won't have invasive pest protections that are tailored to what our States want, product transportation laws, secure containers for animal carcasses and grease—lowest common denominator.

Licensing and permitting of commercial enterprises, for example, professional licensing and pet sellers; you could not prohibit a convicted animal abuser from having a license to traffic animals if the other State doesn't have it.

These are horrific provisions trampling on States' rights, consumer protection, environmental protection, agricultural protection.

This bill should be rejected.

NATIONAL SALVATION ARMY WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Salvation Army Week, and it is a time to recognize the good that this organization does, but also a time to raise awareness about the challenges faced by more than 40 million Americans who are living in poverty, many who are stuck in poverty, quite frankly, because of programs and regulations put forth by Washington, D.C., for decades that serve as a spiderweb and makes people feel more comfortable living in poverty, which is nothing we should ever do.

We should always be working to provide our friends, our neighbors, our neighbors in need with a pathway to opportunity. The Salvation Army is a great organization, actually, that accomplishes that.

With the help of 3.2 million volunteers, the Salvation Army serves nearly 25 million Americans through a range of social services, including food for the hungry, relief for disaster survivors, clothing and shelter for the homeless, and opportunities for underprivileged children.

National Salvation Army Week began in 1954 when Congress approved the joint resolution for President Dwight D. Eisenhower to proclaim a week to recognize the humanitarian efforts of the Salvation Army.

The Salvation Army is one of the Nation's largest and oldest faith-based health and human services providers.

With a presence in every ZIP Code across the country, the Salvation Army uniquely understands the demands facing Americans in need.

Last year, the Salvation Army served more than 56 million meals and provided more than 10 million nights of shelter.

The Salvation Army is on the front lines of the opioid crisis, serving more than 173,000 Americans in 139 rehab centers across the United States.

Since the 1900 Galveston hurricane, the Salvation Army has served survivors and first responders of every major natural disaster and numerous man-made disasters. In any given year, it helps more than 275,000 survivors receive hope, healing, and comfort.

Through a wide variety of job training programs, including culinary, hospitality, and landscaping training, the

Salvation Army helps Americans build the skills they need to acquire gainful employment and lift themselves out of poverty, help them achieve food security.

The Salvation Army takes a holistic approach in addressing people's needs. It supports the physical, emotional, and spiritual development of those that they serve. Data shows that those who utilize the Salvation Army's spiritual and emotional care programs are more likely to reclaim their lives and get back on their feet.

Mr. Speaker, the Salvation Army was established in London in 1865, and for more than 135 years, it has been supporting those in need without discrimination.

Together, we can all join the fight for good. I am proud to honor this outstanding organization that for more than a century has given scores of Americans the help they need during trying times.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as a former law enforcement officer and a member of the House Law Enforcement Caucus to honor the brave men and women in uniform who have paid the ultimate sacrifice to protect, and to thank those officers who are putting their lives on the line every day to protect our communities.

We owe a great debt of gratitude to these men and women and their families, who make their own sacrifices as they see their loved ones off every day.

I remember when I went off every day and said good-bye to my wife and my children. I usually worked nighttime. I remember afterwards coming home, and on some nights when an officer had been killed or shot, and they would mention it on TV, but they wouldn't give the name out until the family was notified. Those times for all the families in a large major police department or a small one are traumatic.

After a while, my son, who was very young at the time, would sit on the stairway going up to the second floor and the bedrooms late in the evening until I came home.

I have lost friends and partners in the line of duty; one, Erwin Jackson, after he saved my life on a robbery arrest, within a year, he was shot dead on a call.

I have grieved with their families, and during the most difficult times, I have experienced firsthand the real sacrifices they make.

This week, my wife, Pat, and I pause to remember our friends, reflect on their service.

Mr. Speaker, last year, 129 officers died in the line of duty across this country.

□ 1045

And so far this year, preliminary reports show 54 officers have died.

Arizona has lost one brave officer so far this year. The family of Nogales Police Officer Jesus Cordova and the entire community continue to mourn his death after he was shot and killed by a carjacking suspect last month. He was the first Nogales officer to be shot and killed in 130 years.

These law enforcement officers served and protected their communities admirably, and while we can never repay the debt we owe them and their families, we will forever remember their service.

This week, 360 officers were memorialized on the National Law Enforcement Memorial here in Washington, D.C.

Three brave Arizonans were honored: Paul Lazinsky of the El Mirage Police Department, whose watch ended last year; Alfred Moore of the Arizona Department of Liquor Control, whose watch ended in 1965; and Rupert Hopkins of the Pima County Sheriff's Office, whose watch ended in 1950.

The memorial also includes Navajo Nation Officer Houston Largo, who died last year while responding to a domestic violence call in New Mexico.

As we look to the future, it is important to highlight the work being done at the local, county, and State levels to improve the relationship between police officers and their communities.

I have seen firsthand how community policing practices benefit both the communities and the officers on patrol. It improves safety, increases trust, and it reduces violence. Communities across Arizona are leading the way in developing strong relationships between these two groups, and I applaud their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the support I have seen this week for our law enforcement community.

I addressed how my family felt. I have spent a lot of time at funerals with the families of those that have fallen, too much time. And I have spent too many times at bedsides with seriously wounded officers. I was a homicide detective, and I investigated their shootings. Please remember in your prayers not only the officers that have fallen but their loved ones.

RECOGNIZING INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, later on this afternoon, in recognition of Infrastructure Week, I will be releasing the second annual overview of transportation and infrastructure priorities in my district, Washington's Seventh Congressional District.

The report features a number of high-priority transportation and infrastruc-

ture projects. The report was developed through conversations and roundtables, tours, workshops, and planning sessions across my district that my staff and I convened.

We have many cities in the district. People know the district for Seattle, which is very, very important, our Port of Seattle, an important institution, but we also have cities like Burien, which is right next to the Sea-Tac Airport, one of the fastest growing airports in the country, and is dealing with the many challenges that comes with that growth.

Each of the priority projects that are covered in this report serves our district by enhancing sustainability, improving the community, and contributing to economic growth and job creation.

My hope is that this report provides an overview of the types of improvements we desperately need to see in King County, the city of Seattle, Snohomish County, Shoreline, Edmonds, Lake Forest Park, Normandy Park, Burien, and the Port of Seattle.

Our challenge, Mr. Speaker, is to keep our district the most livable, sustainable, and welcoming community in the country. It is a challenge.

Just consider the facts:

In 2016, we spent 54.8 hours in traffic, giving Seattle the dubious honor of being one of the top 10 cities for congestion.

In 2015, the lowest earning 20 percent of households in our State spent three times as much, as a percentage of their income, on commuting costs compared to the highest income families.

Especially significant are transit options for my constituents. Transit makes the ultimate difference in being able to reach a place of employment easily, which, in turn, affects how constituents are able to provide for themselves and their families.

While Sound Transit has seen a 23-percent increase in ridership over the last year, we need to ensure that all communities are connected to transit networks and not forgotten.

As King County Metro found in a report from 2015, while 71 percent of minority communities live within a quarter-mile of a Metro bus stop, only 41 percent live within a half a mile of a stop that has frequent service.

Mr. Speaker, transit is also essential to addressing climate change. In our region, nearly 50 percent of our greenhouse gas pollution comes from transportation. In 2015, Washington State's transportation sector contributed 43 tons of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere, making it Washington's highest level since 2007.

Not only do we need to consider impacts to air quality but to water quality as well. In our region, clean water is essential to supporting our economy and national treasures like our salmon and our orcas. According to the Washington Stormwater Center, over 10,000 unique chemicals are found in urban road runoff, contributing to the continuing pollution of Puget Sound.

Yet not a day goes by where I do not draw from the innovations and examples set by our businesses, our individuals, and institutions in our Seventh Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that we are a model for the Nation, whether it is through ideas brought to reality, partnerships formed across diverse interests, or new mechanisms developed to maximize the leverage of any financial instruments.

But there is a lot to do. Later this year, Congress will consider its annual budget and appropriations bills for fiscal year 2019, including, I hope, a potential infrastructure bill.

Democratic Ranking Member DEFAZIO spoke earlier about the critical need for the Federal Government to fund a bold infrastructure plan so that our businesses and our communities across the country can succeed.

That will put people back to work. It will put money into our roads, our bridges, our infrastructure needs, our water systems, our schools across our country, and our transit.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I am committed to fighting for here in Congress.

OPPOSING THE FARM BILL

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today to talk about the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018. We call it the farm bill.

It is supposed to be about supporting farmers, strengthening communities, making sure that we have nutritious food, looking out for our environment, and generally feeding America and even sometimes the world.

Instead, this bill would allow companies to spray pesticides into our waterways, which are endangered all over this country. It will allow all sorts of environmental challenges and will diminish the quality of life for people. They won't even allow a provision to have a Clean Water Act permit to spray pesticides.

The bill is also an attack on local control. I thought local control was a hallmark of what it meant to be conservative. Apparently not, because this bill preempts local governments from taking steps to protect their communities from pesticides. I think a local community is in a better position to understand the health needs of its people than the Federal Government is.

The bill would also make deep cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, a program that used to be called food stamps. There are no actual stamps anymore; this benefit is provided on a card that people use. The 5-year authorization of the farm bill would cut \$23 billion from SNAP—\$23 billion.

The proposal also adds work requirements. Now, some people think: Oh, yeah, what is wrong with making people work for a living? I work for a living.

Well, the truth is, people who use the food stamp program often work for a living too. They just happen to have a tough patch in their lives where they need their neighbors—that is us—to step up and help make sure that they can have food on the table.

The idea that people who have economic hardship don't want to work is simply wrong. This body gives money out to rich people all the time and doesn't ask for any work requirements. We don't ask for many requirements at all, but we do it. It is all part of this shaming and blaming the poor.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that this new work requirement, plus other restrictions proposed by the farm bill, as proposed, would end up denying or reducing nutritional aid to about 2 million people, mostly families with children.

By the way, 70 percent of poor kids in America eligible for food stamps live in a household with somebody who works, but the Federal minimum wage is \$7.25. On \$7.25, that works out to about \$15,000 a year. You could work full-time and be eligible for food stamps.

People who don't work because of whatever difficult patch they hit in their life should not be shamed into not accepting food assistance. If they are not healthy and they are not well-fed, how are they going to get back in the workforce?

Under this proposal, most adults between 18 and 59 will be required to work part-time or enroll in 20 hours a week of workforce training to receive assistance. It would impose stricter eligibility guidelines for low-income families who qualify for SNAP through other welfare programs.

Many SNAP recipients face legitimate barriers to enrolling in these programs, such as unreliable transportation. One of my colleagues already talked about the difficulty with transportation in getting to a better paying job in this economy. Low housing security. A lot of people are homeless. It is very difficult to stay employed if you are homeless. And shifting childcare and medical schedules.

SNAP helps 42 million people in nearly 21 million households. In 2016, SNAP lifted 3.6 million people out of poverty. They were in poverty; now they weren't because of SNAP. It is a good program.

In my own State of Minnesota, more than 69 percent of SNAP participants are families with children. Almost 30 percent are families with members who are elderly or people with disabilities. More than 54 percent are working families.

People who use food stamp benefits work hard every day. They work harder than many of us who earn a lot more than them.

SNAP kept 111,000 people out of poverty in Minnesota, including almost 60,000 children, per year from 2009 to 2012.

Let me wrap up by saying that the farm bill, as currently proposed, I can-

not vote for. I will have to urge a "no" vote, and I hope that we learn something important about people who struggle hard in this economy.

OPPOSE THE FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, I was a free lunch kid growing up. I was the young man that brought his ID card to the lunch lady and she looked on the back for the yellow sticker and I received free breakfasts and free lunches.

I know what it is like to come from a home with a lot of love but not a lot of money. I can tell you for a fact that kids with backgrounds like me cannot succeed in the classroom if they are worried about the next meal.

That is why this GOP farm bill is so reprehensible. Republicans are proposing SNAP cuts that will kick a quarter-of-a-million students off of the free lunch program.

That is right, Mr. Speaker. They have just given massive tax cuts to millionaires and billionaires, but now, to save money, they are trying to pass a bill that could cause poor kids across this country to go hungry.

This legislation is a direct attack on my constituents. It is a direct attack on the poor. One in four families in my district alone counts on SNAP to put food on the table.

They deserve better. Our country deserves better. I urge my colleagues to oppose this shameful legislation.

□ 1100

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE'S WORK ON CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the work being done by the Department of Defense regarding the threat of climate change, and to reinforce congressional intent on this important issue.

Last year's National Defense Authorization Act expressed the sense of Congress that climate change is a direct threat to national security. We have studied a number of readiness factors when it comes to our Armed Forces, but for too long, we have not given this major, multifaceted threat the attention that it deserves.

Current and former military leaders and members of the intelligence community agree that climate change poses a security challenge that has the potential to affect our tactical and strategic readiness.

Secretary Mattis was correct when he stated: "... the effects of a changing climate—such as increased maritime access to the Arctic, rising sea levels, desertification, among others—impact our security situation."

Naval bases, such as Norfolk or Key West, are already at risk for flooding. In fact, Norfolk frequently deals with nuisance flooding, and that risk will only increase as storm surges increase in magnitude and tides continue to rise. Inland bases will experience other weather volatility, such as extreme heat and wildfires, all of which can impact their ability to train, and ultimately impacts readiness.

The displays of dominance in the Arctic will grow, where new sealanes will connect continents more directly than ever before. The changing global climate, Mr. Speaker, will also lead to greater instability in the form of economic migration, increased competition over resources, and possibly more failed states, which we know to be breeding grounds for extremism and terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that a changing climate will alter our joint battle space. So when the U.S. Congress instructs the Department of Defense to take these threats seriously and evaluate the risk posed to our national security by climate change, we need exactly that. Our intent is clear, and there can be no room for misinterpretation.

Last week, The Washington Post reported that during revision of the Department's January 2018 Screening Level Vulnerability Assessment Survey report, Department of Defense officials omitted information pertinent to how our military installations report their vulnerability to sea level rise, how climate change is affecting the operating environment in the Arctic, and the potential risk to the Department's ability to conduct training and testing activities that have important impacts on our readiness.

While I appreciate the need to update reports when it is appropriate and necessary, it is unacceptable to attempt to bend congressional intent for political convenience. The Department of Defense must answer tough questions as to what motivated these changes, if not a skewed political narrative. In fact, the issue of climate change and its impact on national security has become more bipartisan over the last several years.

In fact, last year, in the National Defense Authorization Act, Congress instructed each service within the Department of Defense to assess the top 10 military installations likely to be affected by climate change over the next 20 years. We also instructed combatant commanders to incorporate the effects of a changing climate into their strategic battle plans.

Forty-six Republicans joined with Democrats to support this language on the floor of the House, and I expect that when this report is delivered to Congress later this year, it will make candid assessments in line with the clear language we supported in that floor vote and that was signed into law by the President.

Mr. Speaker, we must ensure that the Department remains resilient and

is prepared to address the effects of climate change on threat assessments, resources, and readiness, as well as to conduct operations both today and in the future. Congressional oversight plays an undeniable role in that process.

Mr. Speaker, the dangers of climate change on our national defense are real, and we support the researchers on the front lines of these critical threat assessments. Together, we can continue to craft a sane and sober strategy to defend the United States from a variety of threats, including climate change.

That is the expressed intent of Congress for the upcoming climate report, and is a necessity as we prepare for our Nation's future.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT LET PEOPLE GO HUNGRY

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues have a point. It is really terrible that some people take advantage of free food and drink to continue their slothful lifestyles. I agree. This conduct must stop.

Of course, Members of Congress can attend lunches and receptions with free food and drink every single day, sleep on the taxpayer's dime in their offices, and have the taxpayers do their laundry, too.

The House has been in session for a measly 50 days this year, and I have compiled at least 54 receptions, which is just the tip of the iceberg of free food and drink available to Members.

But even estimating a modest \$10 for a glass of wine and a plate of appetizers, that means that a Member who attends a reception every night the House is in session, has received a benefit of over \$500 just since the beginning of this year.

That is about the same amount of money as the maximum monthly food stamp benefit for a family of three, except Congress Members are nibbling on pork sliders, and French Brie, and pate, while these poor families are expected to feed each family member three meals a day for 30 days. That breaks down to about \$5.60 for each meal, or about \$1.87 per person per meal.

Now, I am sure none of my colleagues would think that they are better than working people who struggle to keep a roof over their heads and food on their tables. And I am sure all of us are happy to be subject to the same rules that we vote on in this Chamber. So here is my modest proposal: The congressional electronic benefits transfer card, or congressional food stamp card. We will put a little cash in it—say \$1.87 per reception—and Members can figure out how to make their monthly reception budget stretch to fit their wining-and-dining needs.

Maybe we will have Members carrying their single glass of wine from

one reception to another, or maybe they will blow their whole allotment on one plate of shrimp, or maybe—just maybe—we will see more Members of Congress showing empathy for the most vulnerable in our society.

Now, to be clear, there is nothing wrong with private organizations spending their own money on outreach to Members of Congress. I have certainly attended my share of receptions, as has everyone else here. But what is truly repellent in this debate, is the rank hypocrisy.

Here we sit, we get paid \$174,000 a year to work 4 days a week here at the U.S. Capitol, and we are considering a bill that would take food assistance away from millions of Americans. Members of Congress can literally walk down the hall for free appetizers any time of the day or the week.

Yet, Republicans are proposing to deny 265,000 children school meals. Congress can't pass an infrastructure bill or DACA, but we can debate a bureaucratic and ineffective work requirement for people struggling with hunger.

Perhaps if my colleagues ran out of funds on their congressional food stamp card and got a bit peckish, they would remember that in one of the richest countries in the world, we should not let people go hungry. Period.

How can we be debating on whether to starve children whose parents are struggling with low-paying or unstable jobs? You know what should be an unstable job? Giving corporations \$2 trillion in tax cuts while slashing basic food assistance to 20 million children, 5 million seniors, and 1 million veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this disgusting bill. And for those who don't, I will pray that you regret every bite of free shrimp cocktail and every sip of free wine.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 9 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida) at noon.

PRAYER

Monsignor John Zenz, Holy Name Parish, Birmingham, Michigan, offered the following prayer:

Be true to Your name, O Lord, and may we also be true to Your name, O Lord.

You give life to all things and make them holy. Keep us true to Your gift of life.

You manifest Your power by mercy and compassion. May we be true to You as stewards of Your power.

We call upon You as Father. Keep us true to Your providential care for the human family by our loving concern for the common good.

As we approach Memorial Day, may we be true to Your promise of life eternal, remembering all who have died, especially those in the service of freedom and peace.

Be true to Your name, O Lord, and may we always be true to Your name as well.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GALLAGHER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING MONSIGNOR JOHN ZENZ

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of Monsignor Zenz, a staple in southeast Michigan and the pastor of Holy Name Catholic Church.

Ordained almost 40 years ago, Monsignor Zenz received a doctorate in spiritual theology in 1984 and has served the faculty at Sacred Heart for over 35 years.

Starting as a weekend associate at my hometown parish in Birmingham, Michigan, Monsignor Zenz became the pastor at Holy Name in 2008, where he has faithfully served our community since.

He also serves on the board at the Academy of the Sacred Heart and chaplain to the Detroit Chapter of the National Christ Child Society. He is currently a chaplain to the Detroit Cardinal Club and has extensive experience working with Catholic Network of Detroit, ensuring God's word reaches as many homes as possible.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to host Monsignor Zenz here today, and I want to thank him for his tireless service and dedication to southeast Michigan. We should all strive to serve our communities with the same rigor that Monsignor Zenz demonstrates on a daily basis.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Gabrielle Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

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

HISTORIC EMBASSY OPENING IN JERUSALEM

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, I was grateful to lead nine of our colleagues in the House of Representatives on a congressional delegation to Jerusalem for the opening of the U.S. Embassy with Ambassador David Friedman, Ivanka Trump, and Jared Kushner.

I was joined by Representatives MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, RON DESANTIS of Florida, JODY HICE of Georgia, GEORGE HOLDING of North Carolina, STEVE KNIGHT of California, TOM RICE of South Carolina, DENNIS ROSS of Florida, SCOTT TAYLOR of Virginia, and LEE ZELDIN of New York.

I appreciate Armed Services Committee Chairman MAC THORNBERRY for authorizing the delegation.

We had the opportunity to meet with members of the Knesset, the Israeli parliament, and I was especially grateful, as a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to meet with the Knesset Foreign Affairs Chairman Avi Dichter.

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu welcomed us to his office and confirmed our shared heritage. We must work together to stop Hamas terrorist attacks using human shields financed by Iran.

With President Donald Trump, the American-Israeli alliance has never been stronger to protect American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

TREATING THE TERRITORIES UNFAIRLY

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose the Roskam amendment to the Agriculture and Nutrition Act.

This amendment is deeply unfair to territories in the United States and contrary to the original intent of the Animal Welfare Act of 1976. That intent was to aid State and local law enforcement in jurisdictions where gamefowl events were prohibited from transport from jurisdictions which allow it.

Mr. Speaker, cockfighting, like horse racing, is a longstanding recreational activity in the U.S. Virgin Islands with historical and cultural significance. It is regulated in the Virgin Islands along with Puerto Rico.

I understand the concerns of those opposed to this sport and believe regulatory processes and educational outreach are the best means within those jurisdictions to address them.

Outlawing cockfighting in the U.S. territories will only create underground industries, which will prove problematic and create criminality, particularly for men of color.

Mr. Speaker, to pass an amendment that solely affects the territories that none of the Delegates from the territories support is pejorative, paternalistic, yes, colonialist, and downright wrong. The territories have always been treated unfairly under numerous important Federal laws and programs, and this amendment, sadly, is yet another example.

CANCEL THE AUGUST RECESS 2.0

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I stood in this very spot about 1 year ago urging Congress to do the work of the American people, the work they sent us here to do. I introduced a piece of legislation called the Do Your Job Act, which is simple. It would not allow Congress to go into recess unless we have actually done our work, passed all of our appropriations bills.

Instead, I fear that we are going to find ourselves in the same crisis that we found ourselves in just a few months ago. That is why I was glad to see that the President recently said that we should cancel the August recess, if necessary, if we can't do our job.

In just 2 months, we will once again adjourn for a month-long recess without a budget or getting all our appropriations done, to say nothing of the other issues that remain unresolved, like immigration—take your pick.

Once again, if we don't make some hard choices, the government may shut down. I think that is unacceptable. We know exactly how this plays out. We saw it last year, as we careened from one budgetary deadline to the next, with one short-term extension after another.

We simply can't keep repeating these same mistakes over and over again. To do so would be the literal definition of "insanity."

So I urge my colleagues: let's put an end to this madness. Let's stay here, if necessary, even if that means canceling recess. Let's work with a sense of urgency and purpose to better this country, because that is what our constituents sent us here to do.

HONORING SECOND LIEUTENANT RICHARD "RICHIE" COLLINS III

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, my community was shaken by the murder of Second Lieutenant Richard "Richie" Collins III, a young African American stabbed to death while waiting for a bus on the campus of the University of Maryland.

He was a student at Bowie State University just days from graduation. Richie was in College Park visiting friends to celebrate his recent commission as an officer in the United States Army.

He was a young man of great promise, very talented and driven to success. He was popular on campus and helped create Bowie State University's first lacrosse team. He was an avid player of golf, soccer, and baseball. Richie loved deep conversations about life, politics, and philosophy.

The individual on trial for his murder has been charged with a hate crime.

Mr. Speaker, we must do more to combat the spread of hatred by spreading tolerance and respect instead, and we must never forget those, like Richie Collins, whose lives were cut short by hatred and prejudice.

I again offer my condolences, as I have, to Richie's parents, Richard and Dawn, his family, his friends to mark this somber anniversary. We ask for whom the bell tolls; it tolled for us.

RECOGNIZING STEVEN D. HOGAN

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the passing of a truly great American, the mayor of Aurora, Colorado, Stephen D. Hogan.

Mayor Hogan passed away on May 13. Throughout his nearly 8-year tenure as a mayor of my hometown, Steve Hogan oversaw a remarkable and exciting renaissance of the city. Aurora has become Colorado's third-largest city and the driving force behind innovation, development, and economic opportunity. Aurora has also become an even greater place to live, work, and raise a family.

I met Steve Hogan 35 years ago when I returned home to Aurora after having served in the Marine Corps. I have had the distinct pleasure to call him a friend ever since.

Mayor Hogan's career in public service has taken him from serving in the Colorado House of Representatives in the 1970s to serving six terms as an Aurora City Council member and, finally, two terms as the mayor of the city, a city I know he loved so dearly.

Mayor Hogan exemplified the spirit of public service, and my hometown of Aurora would not be the wonderful place it is today without his vision and his leadership. We all are better off because of his decades of hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been able to call Mayor Steve Hogan a friend, and his family will remain in my thoughts and prayers.

AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-125)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith a social security totalization agreement with Slovenia, titled "Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia" and the accompanying legally binding administrative arrangement, titled "Administrative Arrangement between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia" (collectively the "Agreements"). The Agreements were signed in Ljubljana, Slovenia, on January 17, 2017.

The Agreements are similar in objective and content to the social security totalization agreements already in force with other leading economic partners in Europe and elsewhere, including Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland. Such bilateral agree-

ments provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Agreements contain all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and, pursuant to section 233(c)(4), other provisions which I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the estimated number of individuals who will be affected by the Agreements and the Agreements' estimated cost effect. Also included are a summary of the main provisions of the Agreements and an annotated version of the Agreements with descriptions of each article. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration concluded that these Agreements are in the national interest of the United States.

I commend to the Congress the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia and the Administrative Arrangement between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 2018.

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 900 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 900

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes. No further amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such

further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment pursuant to this resolution the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 900, providing for further consideration of a very important piece of legislation for America's farmers and ranchers: H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act, commonly referred to as the farm bill. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2 under a structured rule, allowing for consideration of 31 amendments that were offered.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I traveled to every county in my district for one reason: to listen, to hear, and to get the input and the concerns from farmers, ranchers and producers across central Washington State. I traveled to Pateros, where my constituents discussed the vital need for strengthening market access and opening new sources for exporting across the globe.

I visited with farmers from East Wenatchee in Douglas County who discussed the importance of commodity sourcing and stressed the need for stronger education for the public about farming and where the food that lands on our tables comes from.

I heard from constituents in Prosser and Benton and Yakima Counties who stressed the importance of agricultural research from producers in Quincy, who shared their personal stories of the impacts of crop insurance on their livelihoods, and from farmers in Othello who raised concerns regarding regulatory burdens on the agricultural community.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to say that this farm bill makes great strides in addressing these challenges that face America's farmers. The rule

we bring before the House provides for further consideration of the underlying legislation, H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act, a bill that is critically important to my district in central Washington and to rural districts just like it across the country.

As a farmer myself and as a former State agricultural director, I know how important these farm policies are when it comes to our agricultural economy. This farm bill strengthens the farm safety net to help America's farmers and ranchers compete.

After 5 years of depressed prices, and a 52 percent drop in farm income, our farmers need us—they need Congress—to reauthorize these important programs.

Mr. Speaker, while American farmers have faced these depressed prices and severe drops in farm income, we, luckily, have a robust safety net in place. Due to the previous 2014 farm bill, our agriculture community was able to hold on and continue to provide American consumers with food in our grocery stores, in our schools, and in our food banks.

It is incumbent upon us to ensure these policies continue. We must pass this farm bill and ensure a steady food supply will be on the shelves and in our markets for the years to come.

The underlying legislation includes the creation of a new international market program, which I would argue is more important today than ever before. Programs within it, including the Market Access Program and the Foreign Market Development Program, are incredibly important to producers seeking to maintain and expand their export markets for U.S. agricultural products and commodities. The Market Access Program, on its own, is a net positive program, which for every \$1 spent, \$28 is returned to the American economy.

I know these critical trade and export resources are at the top of the minds of American farmers and producers across the country, and we must continue to ensure their availability and access for the agricultural industry.

This bill also maintains and strengthens the Nation's nutrition programs to assist those who struggle to put food on the table, while providing critical training to help people attain the skills necessary to gain good-paying jobs, financial self-sufficiency, and better futures for themselves and their families. It supports the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, without any cuts in funding. Instead, this bill adds further funding and empowers States with the flexibility on how to best administer their respective programs.

The State of Washington has done innovative work in their administration of SNAP through the BFET and the RISE programs to help some of the most vulnerable populations, and I am pleased that this farm bill will allow these programs to continue if the State so chooses.

This legislation contains employment and education provisions for those who need a hand up due to falling on hard times.

Mr. Speaker, the farm bill contains comprehensive approaches to farm policy, nutrition, trade, conservation, crop insurance, regulatory reform, rural development, animal health, specialty and organic crops, and provisions to help beginning farmers and ranchers.

This rule provides for further consideration of amendments offered by our colleagues in the House on a great variety of these issues. I look forward to listening to the robust debate on potential provisions to strengthen this legislation.

As this is the first farm bill I have had the opportunity to engage in since being in Congress, I welcome input from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and from every perspective. We must continue to bring forward solutions for America's farmers, ranchers, rural communities, and families.

Mr. Speaker, this body, the people's House, is made up of many walks of life. We have physicians. We have attorneys. We have ordained ministers. We have engineers, school administrators, former State and local government officials, scientists, and law enforcement officials. Today, I am proud to come before you as a farmer. I am not the only one.

There are maybe about 20 farmers, ranchers, and producers in the House, in the people's House. Among us are an almond farmer from central California, a blueberry farmer from the State of Maine, a rancher from South Dakota, a cattleman from Kentucky, a rice farmer from Minnesota, and, yes, a proud hops farmer from the Yakima Valley from the State of Washington.

I am privileged to come before you in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act. I humbly urge my colleagues to support the rule, support the bill, and strengthen the future for America's farmers and all of those who depend on them.

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

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

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke yesterday about the big-picture numbers behind this cruel bill, how it would cut the SNAP benefits that families rely on to buy groceries by over \$20 billion. That includes slashing benefits for vulnerable adults like veterans, the chronically homeless, and teenagers aging out of foster care by \$9.2 billion.

There is a provision in this bill that would rip benefits away from nearly 1 million people, mostly from working

families with kids, by eliminating an important State flexibility option called categorical eligibility.

The bill even included a provision that would have constructed barriers to accessing SNAP for those with disabilities who have out-of-pocket utility costs—that is, until Democrats shamed the majority into abandoning it as part of their manager's amendment unveiled late last night.

But get this: this fix didn't come without a cost, Mr. Speaker. Tucked into the manager's package—which was, yet again, written in secret—is a provision that will kick over 600,000 vulnerable adults off of SNAP in the first 2 years after enactment of this bill—2 years before their misguided work bureaucracy goes into effect. Six hundred thousand vulnerable men and women will lose their benefits before they even have the opportunity to take advantage of the majority's new make-work program.

Really? What are you thinking?

This entire bill is an embarrassment, and this manager's amendment only makes it worse. It should be scrapped and sent back to the Agriculture Committee, where we can have real bipartisan negotiations and craft a bill that actually helps people, because despite some changes around the margins, the Republican farm bill remains an unmitigated disaster.

□ 1230

Today I want to zoom in on that big picture and give telling examples of how this disastrous Republican bill would impact real people in their everyday lives, because that is what is at stake with the Republican farm bill. That is what we need to be focussed on, because it goes well beyond the numbers on a page.

McClatchy reported a story earlier this month that put it succinctly, entitled: "50-Something Food Stamp Recipients Could Face Tough Job Search Under Proposed Rules."

Take, for example, a woman named Sabrina, who was quoted in the story. She works side jobs, like cleaning houses and doing yard work, but has a difficult time finding steady employment at her age of 59. This bill will take away her benefits, because she may not meet its 20-hour-per-week requirement. She is working. She is exactly the kind of person my Republican friends say they want to support. Do they think she purposely found jobs that pay so little and have so few hours? That doesn't fit so nicely into the majority's press releases, but that is the reality.

Or take, for example, Thomas, a single dad who lost his wife a few years ago and is raising his preteen daughter on his own. He has worked diligently to find stable employment, but jobs are scarce in his community. Without SNAP and reduced-price school meals, Thomas said he and his daughter "would not be able to survive."

These are the kind of people my Republican colleagues are demonizing

during this debate, and it is deeply frustrating.

Or take Lisa, a working mother of four kids earning about \$14 per hour as a nursing assistant. Lisa has to stretch her monthly income to cover rent and utilities after-school care, clothing, and car costs so that she can get to her job. Currently, she receives a modest SNAP benefit to feed her family and her kids receive free school meals, but because her income is just over the 130 percent threshold for a family of five, she would automatically lose her SNAP benefits if this bill becomes law.

For Lisa, SNAP makes an incredible difference in her ability to feed her children.

Or take Elton, a U.S. Navy veteran who lost his benefits for 2 years because of the strict work requirements and time limits that are already part of the SNAP law. During the 2-year period he was unable to access SNAP benefits, Elton was hungry every day wondering what he could eat in order to get by.

It wasn't that Elton chose not to work. He worked physically demanding jobs his entire life, but he lost his job after an injury. He continues to struggle with health conditions and doesn't have reliable access to transportation; issues that are exacerbating his job search. Under this bill, Elton may lose his modest food benefits entirely.

These are real people, and if the majority on the Agriculture Committee actually took the time and did a hearing on the heartless nutrition title in this bill, they would have heard these and many other real-life stories.

Take a moment to think about what you are doing here. My Republican colleagues are denying food benefits to veterans, single dads struggling to find work, and working moms. Why? Because PAUL RYAN asked you to? Because of a myth that people aren't struggling? It is sickening.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is just legislation by sound bite; bad legislation. It demonizes the poor and trades in stereotypes, apparently just to help some in the majority with their next hit on FOX News.

This bill has real consequences. It will hurt real people, our constituents, yours and mine, in every single congressional district in this country.

Now, it is obvious that this isn't a serious attempt at legislating, because the process here was atrocious. The majority ignored the recommendations from Democratic and Republican witnesses during the Agriculture Committee's 23 hearings on SNAP. Controversial provisions were inserted into this bill without explanation on where they came from. I asked. I still can't find out. Democrats were left in the dark as this legislation was drafted, we were left to read about it in news reports; a total affront to the bipartisan tradition that has defined the farm bill for years.

Now, the majority may be calling this a farm bill, but it is really a total

transformation of our social safety net. It is a farm bill that doesn't even improve the farm economy. Let me state, our farmers work hard, they should be valued, and they certainly deserve a hell of a lot better than what is contained in this bill.

If Republicans want to hurt our workers and denigrate the poor, they are going to have to do it alone, because, make no mistake about it, that is what this bill is designed to do and that is what it will do unless the responsible adults in the Republican Party join us in defeating it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Mr. CONAWAY, and I have worked together on many issues, and I know that he recognizes that the trade promotion programs that I referenced in my opening remarks are vital to our agricultural economy.

For decades, USDA export development programs like MAP have helped American farmers create, expand, and maintain access to foreign markets. Throughout their history, this successful public-private partnership has cultivated hundreds of billions of dollars in exports and created millions of American jobs both in the agricultural sector and in support industries, as well as the program brings a return to the United States economy.

In the findings of the underlying bill, it states: "United States export development programs significantly increase demand for United States agricultural products . . . generating a return of \$28 in added export revenue for each invested program dollar."

Additionally: ". . . our global competitors provide substantially more public support for export promotion than is provided to United States agricultural exporters."

We are at a competitive disadvantage when it comes to the rest of the world when it comes to agricultural trade.

Mr. Speaker, without these private contributions and the private sector's resolve to support our export programs, it is very likely that the U.S. would not be the net agricultural exporter of the highest quality products that we are today. I think it is time that we look at our export promotion programs and take a serious look if we want to continue our exporting success.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill to grow the investment in the MAP and FMD programs and I also offered an amendment that would have made a smaller investment in the MAP and FMD programs, and while we are not considering those amendments today, I am grateful that Chairman CONAWAY has agreed to come and engage in this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. NEWHOUSE for his commitment to ensuring that American farmers and ranchers maintain the tools necessary to remain competitive on the global stage.

As you well know, trade is of immense importance to the agricultural industry, with U.S. agricultural exports estimated at \$140 billion per year and trade accounting for one of every \$5 of agricultural production value.

Through its extensive farm bill hearing series and listening sessions, the committee heard from every segment of the agricultural industry about the importance of maintaining support for our trade promotion and our market development programs, especially considering the uncertainty in the current trade climate.

While I am confident that America's farmers and ranchers are incredibly efficient and can compete with anyone in the world on a level playing field, they simply cannot be expected to compete against foreign treasuries on their own.

So in addition to maintaining and strengthening the farm safety net, H.R. 2 restores and increases funding for the popular and successful Market Access Program and Foreign Market Development Program.

This was no small feat, considering the CBO zeroed out funding for FMD as well as the Technical Assistance for Specialty Crops Program in its most recent baseline projections.

But the committee worked together to get creative and make it happen.

I certainly wish we could have come closer to answering the calls for doubling funding for MAP and FMD, but am proud of the work we did, and believe that the streamlined International Market Development Program will give the newly established USDA Undersecretary for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs the tools necessary to continue tearing down barriers to trade and opening up new markets to U.S. agricultural products.

That said, we can always do better, so I am committed to working with Mr. NEWHOUSE and my colleagues in the Senate to continue searching for additional funding for these important trade promotion efforts while we move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am very appreciative of Mr. NEWHOUSE's efforts and his support for these important programs. I look forward to working with him in conference when the Senate gets their work done after we get our bill passed.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman CONAWAY for his commitment to continue working on this important issue, and I look forward to working with him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), and I ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the gentleman from Washington, is leaving, I would just urge him to read the bill, because if he did, he would realize that if this bill were to become law, there are 60,000 people in his home State of Washington who would lose SNAP benefits just due to categorical eligibility changes alone; more would lose their benefits, but just for this one tweak in this bill.

The majority of the people who would lose their benefits under categorical eligibility changes are working families, working families with kids. Children, Mr. Speaker, will lose their SNAP benefits and many of them will lose access to free school meals.

So, again, for all the talk on the other side about how this bill is somehow a good bill for families, read the bill. It is a pretty cruel bill for working families and for children.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask that we defeat the previous question, and if so, I will offer an amendment ensuring that before the legislation can take effect, the President must certify to Congress that none of the administration's recent trade and tariff actions and negotiations will harm U.S. farmers, ranchers, and other agriculture producers.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS), a member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, hardworking families across the heartland know firsthand what the negative impacts of trade can look like. They have lived through it in places like Galesburg, Illinois, when the Maytag plant padlocked its gates and sent every last one of those jobs to Mexico.

They lived through it in Freeport, Illinois, when venture capitalists bought out the Sensata factory and sent every last one of those jobs over to China.

And today, at the end of planting season, corn growers and soybean farmers and pork producers all across the heartland are getting hit in their wallet by the Trump trade war.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I rode in a John Deere tractor with a young soybean farmer named Jared Kunkle while he was planting his soybeans.

You see, right now as planting season is wrapping up, our farmers are making a lot of tough decisions. That is because in Illinois and many of our neighboring States, our soybean farm-

ers sell about a quarter of their crops to China. In fact, in Illinois, if our State was its own country, we would be the fourth largest producer of soybeans in the world.

So when President Trump's thumbs got the better of him and started tweeting us into a trade war with China, there were very real consequences for the families that I serve. To be clear, those consequences and the harm and uncertainty that they are generating is being felt right now.

In fact, just this morning, there was a headline in Bloomberg News that I want to read to you, I want to show to you: "China Buys Record Amount of Russian Soy as it Shuns U.S. Growers."

That is this morning.

The fact is, our farmers have been struggling in a tightening market with low profit margins. So in 2016, when President Trump stood at a podium in Iowa and proudly declared that he would "end this war on the American farmer," they took him at his word. Midwesterners do that; we believe people when they say something, and we also believe that promises ought to be kept.

For farmers like Jared Kunkle of Cameron, Illinois, and thousands of farmers like him, that promise has been broken.

It has been broken by this President, and now, if you do not support this amendment, it will also be broken by this Congress.

So I urge you, please keep your word. Support this measure to protect our hardworking farmers and ranchers from this Trump trade war. Let's work together. And as the President says, let's "end this war on the American farmer."

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

I think that the gentlewoman from Illinois speaks on behalf of a lot of Members in this Chamber. Nobody wants to see a trade war. Nobody is advantaged by a trade war.

I think so many of the provisions that are in this underlying bill, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2, are designed to create more stability for farm families.

The gentlewoman is absolutely right when she references the instability trade war conversations create. So much more important, then, that we come together now to provide that safety net and that stability that is included here in H.R. 2.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's encouragement that we get to the other end of these trade negotiations, and I do believe that is something that we all share.

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

□ 1245

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to one of the amendments made in order

by this rule. The Foxx-Davis amendment would dramatically alter American sugar policy by eliminating the economic safety net for sugar producers.

There is a Domino Sugar Refinery located in my district in Yonkers, New York, which has been a staple of the neighborhood for almost a century. According to their own figures, the refinery employs 280 people and sustains an additional 138 jobs through trucking, terminal operations, cargo handling, and ship piloting. That is more than 400 local jobs, most of them union jobs, supporting local families and pumping additional dollars into our communities.

These are the men and women I represent, and they are the ones for whom I cast my vote. I will cast my vote against the Foxx-Davis amendment and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

America's sugar policy is working. It has operated at zero cost to taxpayers in 14 of the past 15 years, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture projects that sugar will run at a zero cost to taxpayers over the next 10 years.

According to the International Sugar Organization, food manufacturers in the U.S. pay 10 percent less for sugar than other developed countries. Meanwhile, America's grocery shelf sugar prices are among the lowest in the world.

Again, most importantly, the reason I rise is that the U.S. sugar industry provides good union jobs. Without the current sugar policy, 142,000 American jobs are in jeopardy of being outsourced, and the U.S. stands to lose nearly \$20 billion in annual economic activity.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just spoke about one of the amendments that is going to be offered today. In total, there are 51 different amendments that have been made in order both in the rule that we did yesterday and this rule that we hope that our colleagues will support today, 51 different amendments proffered by Members of this Chamber to try to make this bill better. If we pass this rule today, we will be able to move to the underlying bill for consideration of those amendments.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for reminding us that there were 51 amendments made in order, but he forgot to mention that 54 were blocked.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. LAWSON), who is a member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the House Republican farm bill. I really didn't think that I would have to say the "Republican farm bill" when we worked so diligently in committee.

This bill would strip our Nation's most vulnerable of the necessary resources they need to feed their families. The farm bill would bring hunger and pain to children. The bill kicks 265,000 schoolkids out of free and reduced lunch, and I have attended a lot of those schools where I see the kids on free and reduced lunch.

Florida will be the hardest hit State resulting from the removal of categorical eligibility. In addition, 130,000 hardworking Floridians will go hungry as a result of this farm bill.

The farm bill doesn't just hurt Floridians. It hurts the entire country. It hurts seniors. It hurts college students and young adults. It hurts the disabled, and it even hurts our active military families.

The farm bill also hurts rural communities. I represent several of those rural communities in north Florida, and it also hurts the communities that we border in rural Georgia that I receive calls from.

Before voting on this bill, I want to remind my colleagues of the motto of the USDA, "Do right and feed everyone." The farm bill does not do right, and it surely doesn't feed everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I want to end with a quote from Isaiah 58:10.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. "If you pour yourself out for the hungry and satisfy the desire of the afflicted, then shall your light rise in the darkness and your gloom be as the noonday."

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to associate myself with the gentleman from Florida in his commitment to public service. He is a relatively new Member to this Chamber, but he has been fighting for his constituents since he arrived, and I admire him for that.

There are lot of men and women in this Chamber who fit that bill, Mr. Speaker. I wish we spent more time celebrating those good public servants among us.

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure at this time to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), a gentleman who fits exactly that mold. The gentleman from Maine has come time and time again to this floor, to committees, every single opportunity he has, to build bipartisan support, to work together with his colleagues, to work not just on behalf of the citizens of Maine, but on behalf of all Americans. He really is a model for energy and partnership on something that everyone in this Chamber would agree on.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those kind words. I would agree with him, Maine is the greatest State in the Union. I know he didn't say that, but I know he meant that.

Mr. Speaker, Maine is the home of the most honest, hardest working peo-

ple you can find anywhere in this country. We grew up in a very resilient, independent time in the State of Maine, and we cared for our neighbors and friends because it is compassionate to make sure you extend a helping hand.

Mr. Speaker, my 90-year-old mother was a terrific nurse. She had a career in nursing, caring for thousands of folks in nursing homes and hospitals throughout central Maine. My dad, who is now 88, was a beloved seventh grade social studies teacher and a coach and a basketball official for 30 years throughout the State.

I was raised in a very big-hearted Franco-American family devoted to helping others, and that is why I work so hard to make sure government does the same thing.

I have got some great news for folks across America who are looking to escape poverty and work their way up the ladder of independence. For 2 years, I have been pushing very hard to include job training, commonsense job training, community service, and work requirements for able-bodied adults with no disabilities themselves, no young kids at home, no elderly parents they are caring for, in order to receive food stamps.

We have got to be compassionate, Mr. Speaker, to help folks escape poverty instead of being trapped in a government program that has no end to it. The role of government, Mr. Speaker, is not to keep folks trapped in poverty and help make them comfortable living in it, but to try to give them a helping hand so they can learn a job skill, get a job, and live better lives with more independence.

Now, my work requirement, against what the media has reported and continues to report, has no cuts to food stamps by imposing these work requirements. If the benefits are not used because someone got a job, they are simply recycled back into job training.

And if you are pregnant or caring for young kids or you have a disability yourself, again, you are exempt from these requirements. But if you are able to work, we need to be compassionate and require people to work to lift themselves out of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other part of the farm bill that I am really proud of that is included in the bill, and that is one that helps rural Maine and rural America. For the first time, locally grown fruits and vegetables can now be frozen or dried or pureed in order to qualify for school lunches and school snacks.

That means taxpayer dollars are able to buy foods that are just as nutritious as those that are fresh, save a lot of money, and make sure our kids can eat in a healthy way year round, and it also helps our local farmers.

I have one son, Mr. Speaker, who is 27, and I raised him from the time he was in diapers. Nothing was more important than making sure he had nutritious food on the table to eat. This helps us do that.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everybody to vote "yes" for this farm bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Maine coming here and giving a speech to the cameras, but I would suggest he read the bill. When he says that nobody will lose their benefits, no benefits will be cut from SNAP, he is wrong. The bottom line is that benefits will be cut. Benefits will be cut to support an underfunded, unproven, ridiculous excuse for a workforce and training program.

I also should say I hope nobody wants to emulate the State of Maine when it comes to dealing with people who are struggling in poverty and who need food. I would instruct my colleagues to read an article that appeared in *The Washington Post* last year about what Maine's harsh policies have resulted in.

A veteran who served this country with distinction lost his job due to an injury and, because of Maine's strict work requirements, was thrown off of his SNAP benefits, became homeless, and was skinning squirrels in order to be able to survive. That is not a compassionate policy that I think any State or, certainly, this country should want to reach toward.

One of the things I am proud about the SNAP program is that it means that we recognize that we have an obligation to make sure that nobody in this country goes hungry. Why is that such a radical idea? Why has this program been so demonized?

When the gentleman talks about a life of dependency, read the statistics from the USDA. The average time somebody is on SNAP is less than a year. That is not a life of dependency. I am not sure what he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy of this farm bill from President Donald Trump and the Republicans in this Congress means more subsidies for the rich and greater hunger for the poor.

The food stamp program is one of the most important and successful antihunger programs in our Nation. Last year, it prevented 42.2 million people from going hungry, including 4.8 million seniors and 1.5 million low-income military veterans. And yet my colleagues in the majority are seeking to undermine food stamps as they shield farm subsidies for the rich.

When you take a look at the number of people who are the farm subsidy beneficiaries and the millions of people who are the SNAP beneficiaries, what you will see is that the SNAP beneficiaries get \$1,115 per year, and the farm subsidy beneficiaries get almost \$10,000 a year. Farms receive more than six times the benefit of a person receiving food stamps even though the vast majority of the farm bill beneficiaries are food stamp recipients.

This farm bill would kick 2 million people off of food stamps, cutting bene-

fits by more than \$23 billion. Meanwhile, Republicans refuse to include limits on subsidies provided for crop insurance, one of the few Federal programs without any eligibility caps or payment limits. That is the untold story: who benefits.

In the Republican tax scam for the rich, 83 percent of the benefits went to the top 1 percent. The Republican farm bill is rigged, as well, for the rich.

Farm subsidies, which the CBO says will cost \$12.6 billion more than planned, are so skewed toward the rich that the top 10 percent of farms, about 76,000 farms, received over 60 percent of all farm subsidies.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, SNAP recipients have income limits, asset limits. They get \$1.40 per meal. Millionaires and billionaires who pocket farm subsidies do not.

SNAP recipients have work requirements. Millionaires and billionaires who pocket farm subsidies do not, even though many of them do not work the land.

Nearly 18,000 people in the 50 biggest cities received farm subsidies. They do not work the land. They do not till the soil. Where are their work requirements?

In fact, 23 Republican Members of this Congress who vocally oppose SNAP have financial ties to farms that receive subsidies. They are poised to support this bill. They get theirs while the kids go hungry.

The country needs to know this. In the land of food abundance, in the United States, no one should go hungry. The Republican farm bill is a massive giveaway to the rich, which will deny children in our country food. It is unspeakable. We need to eradicate hunger. We do not need to eradicate the antihunger programs.

□ 1300

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

The farm bill is a little different this year than what we have seen in years past. We would ordinarily have more bipartisan support here on the floor. We got sideways on a couple of issues early on in the process, but the arguments that we are hearing aren't different than the arguments we traditionally hear in a farm bill, as if we are pitting those families in need of food against those families who produce the food. We are not.

This bill is H.R. 2 for a reason, Mr. Speaker. A lot of folks don't understand how bill numbers get handed out in this institution. They get handed out by order of priority.

H.R. 1 was the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. That bill has brought unemployment down to the lowest levels in my lifetime and economic growth to the highest levels we have seen in decades.

H.R. 2 is the farm bill, because if you want to know who benefits from American farm policy, it is anybody who eats—anybody who eats.

I tell folks, Mr. Speaker, we don't need to give every child a laptop. We need to send every child on a mission trip around the globe to see how other families live, to see how other countries do it. We are so blessed in this country, and we take it for granted oftentimes.

For example, I can put up charts about the distribution of farm policy until the cows come home, but the largest 15 percent of farms in this country produce almost 90 percent of all the food.

I will say that again. Those folks who are doing it bigger and better than anybody else, those 15 percent of farmers produce almost 90 percent of American food. And I will tell you something, Mr. Speaker, we can't afford to lose those 15 percent of farmers.

What keeps food in this country available and affordable is a consistent farm policy, which is why, time and time again, Republicans and Democrats come together from across rural America to try to provide certainty to American agriculture.

It is the largest part of the Georgia economy, Mr. Speaker: agriculture. That is true of so many districts, so many States across this land.

This ought to be a partnership. It is not today, and I regret that. We are going to have opportunities to make that change going forward, but just understand, for folks who are here seeing this debate for the very first time, go back and see the farm bill debate from 5 years ago. You will see the same accusations. You will see the same re-creations. You will see the same fear and scare tactics used. Then you will see a huge bipartisan vote because this bill is so important to so many Americans.

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

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

I include in the RECORD the article that I referred for you to read called "Trump to Poor Americans: Get to Work or Lose Your Benefits," which talks about a veteran in Maine that basically was shut out of his food benefit because of Maine's policies.

[From the Washington Post, May 22, 2017]
TRUMP TO POOR AMERICANS: GET TO WORK OR LOSE YOUR BENEFITS

(By Caitlin Dewey and Tracy Jan)

For a period last year after he lost his food stamps, Tim Keefe, an out-of-work and homeless Navy veteran, used his military training to catch, skin and eat squirrels, roasting the animals over an open fire outside the tent he pitched in frigid Augusta, Maine.

The new additions to Keefe's diet resulted from a decision by state authorities to tighten work requirements for recipients of the social safety net—forcing the 49-year-old, who lost his job at a farm equipment factory because of an injury, off the food stamp rolls.

"I was eating what I could find, and borrowed from friends and strangers," Keefe

said in testimony to the Maine legislature. "There were many times . . . when I would go two or even three days without food. If one was inclined to lose a lot of weight, I could recommend this diet wholeheartedly."

Now the Trump administration in its first major budget proposal has proposed more stringent work requirements—similar to those in effect in Maine and other states—to limit eligibility for food stamps and a host of other benefits as part of sweeping cuts to anti-poverty programs.

The White House budget proposal, due to be unveiled on Tuesday, would reduce spending on anti-poverty programs from food stamps to tax credits and welfare payments by \$274 billion over a decade, largely by tightening eligibility for these programs, according to administration officials. With additional reforms on Medicaid and disability insurance, total safety net cuts would top \$1 trillion over 10 years.

Making low-income Americans work to qualify for so-called welfare programs is a key theme of the budget. "If you are on food stamps and you are able bodied, we need you to go to work," said budget director Mick Mulvaney during a White House briefing on Monday.

He said the strengthened requirements in the budget focuses on putting the 6.8 million unemployed or underemployed Americans back to work. "There is a dignity to work," he said, "and there's a necessity to work to help the country succeed."

The White House did not offer details Monday on how the work requirements would be implemented, other than saying it would be "phased in" for able-bodied adults without dependent children.

The White House estimated the combined reforms to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, better known as food stamps, would generate nearly \$193 billion in savings over a decade.

In addition to SNAP reforms, Trump will propose taking the earned income and child tax credits away from undocumented immigrants working in the United States, many of whom pay taxes or have American born-children. That reform alone would save \$40 billion over a decade, according to the White House.

Anti-poverty advocates say the White House could implement its desired reforms to SNAP in two ways: require recipients to work more than the current minimum of 20 hours a week, or cut the unemployment waivers in areas with high joblessness rates.

The influential Heritage Foundation, as well as a number of House conservatives have championed a crackdown on waivers, leading many anti-poverty advocates to conclude that is the most likely way the White House would implement its proposed reforms.

Robert Rector, a senior research fellow at the Heritage Foundation who has asked the White House to prioritize work requirements, said the Trump administration needs to "go after" the four million able-bodied adults without dependents in the food stamp program.

"You say to them, 'We will give you assistance, but come to the office one day a week to do job search or community service,'" Rector said. "When Maine did that, they found almost immediately that their caseload dropped 85 percent."

Critics say such a change could endanger people like Keefe, a veteran who has been unable to find a job after injuring his wrist on the job at a plow factory in Rockland, Maine. As a result, Keefe now is medically unable to lift more than 25 pounds—which disqualifies him from other work in manufacturing.

The Navy veteran was one of several thousand former food stamp recipients who lost

benefits when Maine, in 2015, declined to renew its waiver and reinstated statewide work requirements. He has spent much of the last year living in a tent.

"I don't wanna worry no one," said Keefe, who recently testified to Maine's Committee on Health and Human Services about the impact the work requirement had on him. But, he added: "I hope they understand that people fall through the cracks."

The Trump administration is considering other changes to SNAP. While details remain sparse, Mulvaney said the federal government would be asking states to share in the costs for the food stamps program, through a phased-in "state match" so they have a "little more skin in the game."

"We believe in, the social safety net. We absolutely do," Mulvaney said. "What we've done is not to try and remove the safety net for folks who need it, but to try and figure out if there's folks who don't need it that need to be back in the workforce."

Suspending employment waivers would hit hard in areas with high unemployment such as southern and central California, where the unemployment rate can spike as high as 19 percent, as well as cities such as Detroit and Scranton, Pa., where joblessness remains rampant. The change would also hit hard in large portions of New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, West Virginia, Idaho and Michigan.

"It's unconscionable, cruel and ineffective," said Josh Protas, the vice president of public policy at Mazon, a national anti-hunger organization. "I'm honestly not sure what their goal is."

Critics say the changes in unemployment waivers would be devastating for Native American families living on reservations in North and South Dakota, Arizona and Montana where there is chronic poverty and high unemployment.

"The President's budget proposal will force kids in rural America to go hungry while wasting billions of taxpayer dollars on misplaced priorities like a wall that won't keep us safe," said Senator Jon Tester (D-MT), in a statement to the Post. "Parents in Montana and across Indian Country should not have to choose between food for their tables, gas for their cars, and shoes for their kids."

The number of Americans on SNAP remains high, however. In 2016, 44 million Americans receive the benefits, compared to just 28 million people in 2008.

"They have not come down like we would expect them to do," Mulvaney said. "That raises a very valid question: Are there folks on SNAP who shouldn't be?"

Anti-hunger advocates argue that, generally speaking, there are not. Because SNAP benefits decrease gradually with increased income, there is no incentive for people to avoid work to get benefits—a phenomenon economists call the "welfare cliff." And benefits are too small for people to subsist on them without working: The average food stamp benefit was \$465 a month for a family of four in 2015. Most people are on the program for between seven and nine months on average.

"The notion that people would prefer not to work to get that benefit, give me a break," said U.S. Representative Jim McGovern, (D-Mass.) a longtime anti-hunger advocate. "This is a lousy and rotten thing to do to poor people. They look at SNAP as an ATM to pay for their other priorities."

Additionally, three quarters of households using SNAP contain children, seniors, or people with disabilities, said Elaine Waxman, a senior fellow in the Income and Benefits Policy Center at the Urban Institute. Without SNAP, the country would have had 3 to 4.5 million more people in poverty during the recession, she said.

More than a quarter of able-bodied adults without dependents on SNAP do not have a high school diploma, Waxman said; another 57 percent don't have college degrees—putting them at a disadvantage when it comes to finding work.

A number are also veterans, young adults aging out of the foster care system, and felons recently released from jail. SNAP recipients who cannot find work, for these or other reasons, are supposed to attend job training programs—but they're not widely available because of lack of funding.

"This is the trick. On the one hand, you want people to do something, when in fact a lot of folks may not realistically be able to find a job," Waxman said. "Most states don't want to put the money in. This is a dilemma that we're in."

The evidence that stricter work requirements actually cause people to get jobs is mixed, at best. In Kansas, which reinstated the requirements in October 2014, 40 percent of unemployed adults were still unemployed a year after being kicked off SNAP. Among former SNAP participants who lost benefits, the average annual income was only \$5,562, according to the Foundation for Government Accountability, a right-wing think tank based in Florida.

Progress has also been hotly debated in Maine, a state that conservatives regularly hold up as evidence that stricter work requirements are effective. When the state dropped its waiver in 2015, the number of unemployed adults in the program immediately fell by nearly 80 percent.

But a May 2016 report by the state found that nearly 60 percent of those affected individuals did not report any income in the year after they left the program—suggesting they were still unemployed or underemployed a year later.

On the national level, Michael Tanner, a senior fellow who focuses on social welfare issues at the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank, said he doesn't think similar mandates will have a huge impact on moving large numbers of recipients into employment or result in significant budget savings. Most SNAP recipients who can work are already working, and many of those who are not meet one of the various exemptions such as being disabled.

"It's making a statement that Republicans think people who are on public assistance should be doing all they can to get off," Tanner said, "and that means working whenever possible."

McGovern, who sits on the House Agriculture Committee, said he was surprised to learn about the White House proposal given Agriculture Secretary Sonny Perdue's testimony before the committee last week saying he did not favor any major changes to the food stamps program.

"It's been a very important, effective Program," Perdue said, according to a recording of the hearing. "As far as I'm concerned we have no proposed changes. You don't try to fix things that aren't broken."

The Trump administration is advocating other "fixes" to the safety net, as well. The budget will also propose requiring people to have a Social Security number to collect tax credits. Mulvaney said it is unfair that taxpayers support immigrants working illegally in this country.

"How do I go to somebody who pays their taxes and say, 'Look, I want you to give this earned income tax credit to somebody who is working here illegally? That's not defensible,'" Mulvaney said.

Rector, of the Heritage Foundation, said he also hopes Trump will prioritize work requirements for those receiving housing subsidies. Mulvaney did not address that on Monday.

Diane Yentel, president of the National Low Income Housing Coalition, said the majority of Americans receiving housing subsidies are elderly, disabled or already include someone who works. Of the remaining households, nearly half include a preschool child or an older child or adult with a disability who needs the supervision of a caregiver.

Establishing work requirements for the remaining six percent of households who are 'work able' but not employed would require state and local housing agencies already facing funding shortfalls to establish cumbersome monitoring and enforcement systems for a very narrow segment of rental assistance recipients, she said.

"This is neither cost effective nor a solution to the very real issue of poverty impacting millions of families living in subsidized housing or in need," Yentel said in a statement to the Post.

Correction: This story incorrectly stated the average annual income for SNAP participants in Kansas who had lost and then found jobs was \$5,562. That figure applied to all SNAP participants who had lost the benefit.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia suggests that we all take a mission trip around the world to see hunger and see how lucky we are here in the United States.

Let me tell the gentleman, you don't have to go halfway around the world to see hunger. I can take you halfway down the block, and you can see hunger right here in our Nation's capital and in every congressional district in this country.

There are over 41 million Americans who are hungry or food-insecure in this country. We are the richest country in the history of the world. We all should be ashamed. We ought to do something about it, and this farm bill makes hunger worse.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), a distinguished member of the Agriculture Committee.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would posit to my colleague across the aisle who said that we are trying to pit farm producers against food recipients, I believe that it is this bill that has done that.

We have worked in a bipartisan manner for, I understand, years before this bill was put through without being discussed, without the hearings on both sides of the aisle.

I try to think about what it would have meant to impose the massive system of new SNAP requirements under the bill during the time immediately after the islands were hit by two Category 5 hurricanes. How would families submit their monthly paperwork? How would they go to jobs at businesses that were shut down? How would job slots be provided when localities must focus on providing receipts?

There is no accommodation for disaster-impacted areas in this bill. And if the majority did not think to exempt out these communities, what else was overlooked in terms of reasonable standards?

Unfortunately, we didn't have the opportunity to work with the majority to

get answers to such key questions before this bill was unveiled and rushed to the floor.

This doesn't add any help to farmers facing record-low income and commodity prices or hardships due to trade retaliation, as my colleague from Illinois discussed earlier. It does not support farmer mental health, appropriate funding for broadband, or tackling the opioid epidemic.

This bill cuts hundreds of millions out of rural development and energy initiatives and falls short on assisting beginning, underserved, and veteran farmers. Why? Because it is not a bipartisan bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

My colleague has gone through some really challenging times in her community, and this Chamber has stood with her in those times. She has been a great advocate for her community in the face of some really extraordinary disasters.

We can make accusations on this floor all we like, but we could also spend some time bragging about those things that bring us together. There are already disaster provisions in law—disaster provisions that provide specifically disaster SNAP, for example, when communities are so hard-hit. We do have these conversations, we do have these concerns for one another and our communities, and we do work together to address those concerns.

We are not always successful, Mr. Speaker, but I promise you we are less successful when we don't work together than when we do.

My understanding—I don't sit on the Agriculture Committee, but my friends across the aisle do—is that not a single Democratic amendment was offered in committee.

It is my understanding—and, again, I don't sit on the committee. I don't mind being corrected. I won't be embarrassed at all to have the RECORD corrected. But my understanding is there were 5 hours of markup in the Agriculture Committee, and not one idea for improving the bill was offered.

Now, that is a legitimate, strategic position to take if folks want to take it, Mr. Speaker. I just don't understand it as someone who wants to get the job done and make a difference in a collaborative way on behalf of the American people.

This bill is getting better every single day. It has gotten better through every conversation. As you heard my friend from Washington say in his opening statement, so many farmers with real-world experience—we heard yesterday from Members who have real-world labor and workforce development experience. This bill is getting better every time.

If we support the rule that we are discussing at this time, Mr. Speaker, it will make 31 additional amendments in order so that we can improve the bill even further.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to think of a response to the gentleman from Georgia, who is trying to defend the process in the Agriculture Committee as that somehow, with this bipartisan process, Democrats didn't want to participate.

But you know what? It is just not worth it. We have been explaining it over and over and over again. This process is indefensible. It really makes a mockery of the Agriculture Committee, and it makes a mockery of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have not had the privilege to serve on the Agriculture Committee, but, given the comments of the gentleman there, I would suggest as an amendment that, since this bill is about work, we have work for 12-year-olds. Maybe boys could be shoeshine boys and the girls could be shampoo girls at the beauty salon so that they can help subsidize families.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that is appropriate for this discussion: "If you aren't at the table, you are on the menu." And children are definitely on the menu and at the tender mercies of the job market.

This bill will cut access not only for SNAP but kids who go to school every day. This means in my State there will be 23,000 kids who will not get school lunch and breakfast because of this bill.

I am going to turn in, Mr. Speaker, some of the stories of people in my district who need SNAP, real people, single people like Jana, who has worked on a job for 11 years, lost her job, and has been looking for work for 3 months and couldn't find it.

I would ask that we reject this bill for people who need SNAP to survive. This bill is not about work. It is about taking food out of the mouths of babes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia: Do you have any speakers over there or anybody who wants to talk about this bill? Because we have a ton, and we just want to—

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. It is an inquiry. I don't want to take it on my time.

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to answer the inquiry, or we could just leave it as an inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. As long as it doesn't come out of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, but it is not coming out of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we do have additional speakers remaining, and, of course, if we make this rule in

order, if we pass this rule, we will have 31 different amendments and speakers coming down on each one of those as well.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, I am just taking note of all of the excitement on your side of the aisle on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague Mr. MCGOVERN for yielding me the time and doing such a wonderful job on a very challenging bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the current version of the farm bill. There are many reasons why—among them, the unrealistic challenges to food assistance programs that will have a big negative impact on my State in Maine.

What I want to focus on in my limited time is how much this legislation does a disservice to the farmers in rural communities we represent.

The public is very clear. They want greater access to healthy, locally grown food. They want more of it grown organically, and they want to support local farmers in rural economies. But Federal policy is way behind the times, and this legislation would make it much worse.

Farmers aren't ignoring the trends that consumers are asking us for. They are capitalizing on them. In my State, the changing market and the demand for locally grown and organic food has reinvigorated the State's agriculture economy.

Josh Girard, who is pictured here, is one of those farmers. After earning a master's degree, working abroad in the Peace Corps, and apprenticing at local farms, Josh decided to return to his hometown to start his own farm.

The small sources of Federal support available to farmers like Josh pale in comparison to what commodity farmers receive, but it can make all of the difference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIQUIN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Maine.

Ms. PINGREE. For instance, Josh uses the Organic Certification Cost Share Programs to help cover the cost of certification, which helps him get more for his product. The funding for this and many other programs is endangered in this farm bill.

Over the next 5 years, consumers will continue to change their buying habits in our food system. The question is whether the Federal Government would make good policy to help farmers like Josh.

Ask anyone in this Chamber if they support rural America, and they will say, yes, absolutely. So I ask that we put our money where our mouths are.

We should send the message to those keeping our farming communities alive

that we believe in their potential, we value their service, and we will help them succeed by voting down this terribly partisan legislation and start over on making a good bill.

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

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

The gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) talked about how we are literally taking the food away from children. I want to make it clear to my colleagues, there should be no mistake: This bill is going to hurt kids.

First, it cuts 1 million people off of benefits through categorical eligibility challenges alone. These people are working families with kids. And once these kids lose their SNAP benefits, CBO, the nonpartisan group of experts that we rely on, expects 265,000 children will lose access to free school meals.

I ask my colleagues: Is that what you want out of a farm bill? We can do so much better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Georgia is a rural State, like so many jurisdictions represented in this Chamber. Sometimes you have a big city in one part of the State and the rest of the State is rural. The conversations we have in Georgia are often not Republicans against Democrats politically; it is Atlanta against the rest of the State politically.

Folks often don't connect the dots between the food that they are buying on the shelf at Kroger being directly related to whether or not farmers are producing that food in the field.

We have made huge strides in terms of trying to bring more fresh produce not just into our school systems but into our local farmers markets, huge strides into making sure that electronic benefits aren't just able to be used at the local convenience store but are able to be used in farmers markets so that higher quality produce can end up on families' tables.

□ 1315

Again, Mr. Speaker, we can find disagreement in every bill that comes to the floor, but we can also find progress. There is a lot of progress in this bill. We will support this rule, we will get to the underlying bill, and we will spend the rest of the day discussing exactly that.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill which, much like the Republicans' tax measure, comforts the comfortable and afflicts the afflicted. It will have devastating impacts on SNAP recipients across the Nation, including one in seven in Ne-

vada who are on this program. It will take away food assistance from some of our most vulnerable: young children, seniors, and the disabled. It will also force families to jump through extra hoops in order to access other needed benefits like assistance with their electricity bills.

We can and should be doing more to lift families out of poverty and end hunger in the United States. Shamefully, this bill does just the opposite.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to this cruel and mean-spirited farm bill, a farm bill that will leave working families and our children out in the cold.

The farm bill we are debating today cuts \$23 billion from SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. That would leave 2 million Americans without the support that they need to put food on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I represent both rural and urban, from Birmingham to the Black Belt of Alabama, and I can say definitely that every community in my district will be worse off under this bill.

For children and working families in my district, SNAP means the difference between a hot meal or going to bed hungry. For farmers and grocery stores in my district, SNAP is an investment in our food system that creates 50,000 agricultural jobs across the country.

After the Republicans have shoved down a tax bill that gives the cuts to the wealthiest Americans and adds \$2 trillion to our deficit, they now want to cut the benefits for hungry children and working families.

I believe this is morally wrong. You see, Mr. Speaker, the face of SNAP in my district is not the welfare mother trying to get over. No. The face of SNAP in my district—where 70 percent of the people who are beneficiaries in my district are children under the age of 17 years old—the face of SNAP in America are needy children.

We must and can do better. I am going to vote "no," and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. Speaker, we feel very passionately about issues on this floor. I want to give my colleague from Alabama an opportunity to retract the accusation that this is a mean-spirited and cruel bill. I know the men and women who serve on the Agriculture Committee, and they don't have a mean-spirited or cruel bone in their body. They care about farmers, and they care about families.

We can argue about whether or not if you are a working aged, able-bodied, childless man in this country whether or not we ought to try to get you a job while you are collecting Federal benefits. We can talk about that. I don't

think that is mean-spirited at all. I don't think that is cruel at all. I think that is exactly what we ought to be doing to lift families up out of poverty.

But I would say to my colleagues with their passion—which I know is heartfelt—feeding hungry children is a shared priority, and we see that every single day in the bills that are passed here; and we do damage to this institution and we do damage to the very honest and needed debates we have in this Chamber when we characterize one another in ways that we know are not accurate.

I know the men and women on the Agriculture Committee. I know why they chose to serve on that committee. I believe in the work they are doing. I regret that we are having this disagreement today, but we don't need to question each other's motives or integrity in order to make this debate of value.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill because it is a missed opportunity. I had offered numerous, fiscally responsible reform amendments to improve the bill, all of which were rejected last night.

For instance, why is a farm entity with an adjusted gross income of over \$500,000 a year still receiving taxpayer subsidies under this bill? Why can't we at least track the crop insurance premium subsidy payments to the individual entities?

Right now, that is currently prohibited under the bill. That is not right. The American taxpayer deserves to see how their tax dollars are being run.

Why are we eliminating the entire Conservation Stewardship Program when three out of every four farmers applying for conservation funding assistance today are denied because of inadequacy of funds?

This farm bill should be about helping our family farmers succeed, not a sop to powerful special interests here in Washington. That is why this is a missed opportunity.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who is one of my classmates in the class of 2011. We were once Budget Committee mates together back in the day.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of the 2018 farm bill.

Missouri farmers work hard every day to feed the world, and they need the certainty that this legislation provides. This bill strengthens safeguards for our food supply and improves public-private risk management programs that are vital to American agriculture.

In addition, the farm bill makes significant investments in broadband infrastructure in rural America by setting a minimum speed for Federal investment.

This bill contains historic improvements to SNAP which helps recipients break the cycle of poverty by improving work opportunities for able-bodied adults receiving Federal nutrition assistance. This bill also promotes work and individual success while empowering those dependent on government assistance.

These reforms will reduce unemployment and instill a sense of pride and work ethic by helping people move from dependency to independence and self-sufficiency. These are common-sense improvements that we are discussing today.

The 2018 farm bill is a responsible and effective piece of legislation which maintains safety net programs in crop insurance for America's farmers while making investments in job training programs to lift those in need out of poverty.

This bill has my full support, and I thank and commend Chairman CONAWAY for his hard work on moving this legislation forward.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to speak against an amendment included in this rule, the Foxx-Davis amendment, in defense of the 2,300 factory workers and 900 family farmers who grow sugar beets in my community.

The sugar program in this country supports family farmers. The company that is formed is a co-op formed by local family-owned growers who come together, and all they ask for is a fair chance to compete, to grow their high quality product, and to not have to compete with state-subsidized foreign sugar that is dumped if we don't have a program that protects our local growers.

The question is really simple. It comes down to marginally increasing the profits of large corporations or supporting family farmers who support their families by growing high quality sugar beets and sugarcane in this country.

This is a program that does not cost the taxpayers a dime according to CBO.

It comes down to a simple question: Are we going to support our own growers, or are we going to support foreign-produced sugar and moderately, if at all, increase the profits of large companies?

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan. He actually spent a good deal of his time just the other day in a Budget Committee hearing trying to help get us some bipartisan solutions.

He got grilled by both the Republicans and the Democrats. Everybody wanted their ounce of Michigan flesh in that day. But at the end of that conversation—and I don't say this flipantly—I felt more optimistic about

our coming together and doing some very difficult infrastructure investments in this country than I did when I walked into that room.

Those things don't happen without people investing the kind of time and energy that Representative KILDEE has invested over his career. I want to tell the gentleman how much I appreciate that.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman how many more speakers he has remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend I am prepared to close when he is.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to give credit where credit is due. This majority can't balance a budget; they can't even pass a budget. They can't fund the government without first shutting it down. They are so busy cozying up to the big banks and passing tax cuts for the wealthy that they ignore virtually every major issue facing our Nation. Right now as we speak, this Republican majority is trying to jam through a farm bill that won't even help most farmers.

But the one thing this Republican majority is incredibly good at, and the one thing that they do with ruthless efficiency is stick it to poor people. This majority is Robin Hood in reverse. They are master legislators for the megawealthy. They might want this Chamber to look out solely for those at the top, giving them more tax breaks, making it easier for them to pollute our planet and systematically attacking the safeguards we put in place to stop another financial collapse, but while they work with unflagging, unshakeable, and dogged determination to give a helping hand to the fat cats, they tell those struggling to get by and those begging for an opportunity and a living wage that they should just work harder.

Never mind that they didn't grow up in nice neighborhoods or in a stable home with good nutrition and a quality education. Maybe they started out in life having to play catchup. Maybe they need just a little help from the Government to make the American Dream a reality in their life. Or maybe they were born with advantages but have fallen on hard times and they need a little bit of help.

I am standing here today—Democrats are standing here today—giving a voice to our workers, the middle class, and those trying to break into the middle class. If my Republican friends actually listened to their voices, they would join us and vote against this monstrosity of a bill that attacks working American citizens and takes lunch money away from children.

It is disgusting, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and the rule, and I urge all of you—no, I plead with all of you—to vote "no" on this bill.

I grew up in a family where helping those who were struggling was the right thing to do, the decent thing to do. Please send this bill back to committee. Surely we can do better. Let's demonstrate to the American people that we are here to help, that we care, and that we are decent.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia commented that we are all so emotional on this side of the aisle when we are debating this issue. You are damn right we are. We are emotional. We are angry. We are frustrated because people are going to be hurt.

Mr. Speaker, if you have ever met a hungry child, it should break your heart, and there are millions and millions in this country who are hungry. We are the greatest country in the history of the world and the richest country in the history of the world, and tens of millions of our fellow citizens are food insecure or hungry.

Why isn't that a priority? Why isn't that a bigger priority than another tax cut for a big corporation? I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle deep down inside care about those who suffer in this country. Here is an opportunity to prove it. Let's do a farm bill that actually doesn't make hunger worse in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not even asking you to eliminate hunger, although I wish that were a priority. I am just saying: don't make it worse. This bill will throw millions of people off of a food benefit, and millions of children will be impacted.

Mr. Speaker, they are not just people who aren't working. You know better than that. Many of these people are working families, people who are working hard but can't make ends meet. You are taking away a food benefit. What is wrong with this institution? We can do better.

Mr. Speaker, vote "no" on this rule, and vote "no" on this bill.

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

□ 1330

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friends on the Agriculture Committee for the work they did on this bill. It is not easy to do big pieces of legislation. We do a farm bill every 5 years. It is always a hard thing to do, and my friends on the Agriculture Committee have taken the slings and arrows. You have heard the accusations that have been made just here on the floor today.

The unemployment rate in this country, Mr. Speaker, is as low as it has ever been in my lifetime, and the number of childless, working-age men who are sitting it out is as high as it has ever been in my lifetime.

We can argue about how to care about people more, we can argue about

how to love people more, but I will tell you, helping someone to find a job matters.

Historically, Mr. Speaker, it is one of those things we agree on. For whatever reason, we have made it the topic of something we are going to pretend to disagree on today.

There are more jobs available in this country than ever before. I think we owe it to families that haven't been able to connect themselves with that job market to help them to do better.

Mr. Speaker, so often, we talk about all the lawyers in Congress, all the lawyers who are bureaucrats, all the folks who are working on policy that they just don't understand. I want to close with where my colleague from Washington State began. Of course, he is a former agriculture commissioner from Washington State. He said this.

He said he is not the only farmer in this House. There are 20 farmers, ranchers, and producers serving here in the people's House: an almond farmer from central California, a blueberry farmer from Maine, a rancher from South Dakota, a cattleman from Kentucky, a rice farmer from Minnesota, and a hops farmer from the Yakima Valley in Washington State.

Mr. Speaker, this body really does reflect working Americans, folks out there trying to be the breadbasket to the world, trying to put fresh produce on the shelves for every American family to benefit from. This bill continues our commitment to serving the hungry, and it continues our commitment to being the finest agricultural production nation that this planet has ever seen.

Vote "yes" on this rule. Let's consider some amendments to make this bill even better, and then let's send it to the Senate and give the American people a bill they can be proud of.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule governing debate, and the underlying bill, regarding H.R.2, the so-called "Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018," the House Republicans' failed attempt to produce a Farm Bill that is good for America.

A more fitting name for this terrible and bitter legislative pill would be the "Let Poor Families and Children Starve so Billionaires Can Get Fatter Act."

Going back to 1962, beginning with Senators Hubert Humphrey, Bob Dole, and George McGovern, Farm Bills have always attracted bipartisan support and engendered an enduring alliance between urban and rural legislators in the common cause of ensuring livable incomes for farm families and an affordable and nutritious food supply.

With this purely partisan bill, House Republicans have turned their back on this 56 year heritage.

Mr. Speaker, St. Augustine, the great Catholic theologian, said: "Without justice, what else is the state but a gang of robbers?"

There is no justice in this Farm Bill, but there is harm—lots of it—inflicted on the most vulnerable, so much so that many people are saying that the House Republican majority has produced a bill that is worthy of a gang of robbers.

I oppose this rule and underlying legislation for several reasons but most of all because of its abject cruelty to American's most vulnerable families and children.

H.R. 2 slashes \$23 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program ("SNAP"), a lifeline depended upon by millions of families and children to provide for their daily nutrition needs.

But who among us can say they are truly surprised?

Since taking office sixteen months ago, the President has made abundantly clear his indifference to the most vulnerable citizens in society.

And he has been aided in his endeavors by a feckless House Republican majority.

The President began his presidency with a concerted and determined push to repeal the Affordable Care Act, a law which has helped over 17 million individuals gain health insurance; reduced the uninsured rate by 40 percent and, provided 89 percent of Americans with the security and peace of mind that comes with access to affordable quality healthcare.

When that effort failed, the President next turned his efforts to passing the massive Trump-GOP Tax Scam, which slashed taxes for the top one percent and multi-national corporations, but the negative consequences of which the Trump-GOP Tax Scam have been devastating for the average American.

The GOP Tax Scam has now been revealed not to generate broad-based economic growth but instead to create annual trillion dollar deficits as far as the eye can see.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to be honest about creating an environment where individuals have an opportunity to emerge from poverty conditions, there must be access to nutritious food.

SNAP is a critical component to providing food security to lower-income Americans.

SNAP sets children up for success.

Children on SNAP achieve higher test scores and are more likely to graduate from high school, helping to break the cycle of poverty and build a stronger economy in the long term.

SNAP is temporary.

The average family spends just ten months on SNAP, receiving assistance only during difficult times.

(SNAP is critical for poor and working families.

Most participate in SNAP when they are between jobs.

Among households with at least one working-age non-disabled adult roughly 80 percent of SNAP households work in the year before or the year after receiving SNAP.

Close to two-thirds of SNAP recipients are children, elderly, or disabled.

The vast majority of those who are required to work, do work.

The average per person benefit is \$132 per month, or about \$1.60 per meal.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill were to become law, it would cut \$23 billion from SNAP and would kick one million households off the program.

That means 83,000 Texas families would see their benefits cut, impacting more than 96,000 individuals.

In Texas, over half of all SNAP beneficiaries live below the poverty line so cutting access to SNAP would be devastating.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we not increase food security for the least vulnerable among us.

If our children are not adequately and safely housed, they are not protected from life's crueler elements.

If they are not fed, they lack nourishment and preparation for school and all its challenges.

Mothers know this and their children know this.

Everyone knows this, with the apparent exception of the President and House Republicans.

The House Republicans' eagerness to sacrifice poor and working families and children by cutting SNAP and other food assistance programs for up to 23 million people by \$23 billion is an accurate reflection of their priorities and values, which favor tax cuts for multinational corporation and the top 1 percent at the expense of the poor and working class and those striving to enter the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, there are other major insults, injuries, and cruelties inflicted on working families by this callous legislation.

This so-called Farm Bill changes SNAP from a food program to a work program by imposing new draconian work requirements on adult SNAP participants between 18 and 59 years old, requiring documentation showing 20 hours per week of work or participation in a job training program.

The changes include severe, harsh penalties if the paperwork is not filed on time, ignoring the reality of low-wage work, which is plagued by unstable, uncertain work schedules, unpredictable hours, and few benefits like paid sick or family leave.

This mean-spirited legislation threatens free school meals for 265,000 children and SNAP eligibility for 400,000 households by eliminating Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility (BBCE), which allows states flexibility to link their social service programs to SNAP.

The bill also severs the connection between SNAP and Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), which helps families pay their energy utilities, adversely impacting working families and people with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, this wretched legislation is an equal-opportunity catastrophe because it also inflicts serious damage on farm families and rural America at a time of great challenge and economic uncertainty.

Farm prices are plummeting amid the self-inflicted damage of President Trump's tariffs yet this bill instead of providing relief exacerbates the economic and social pain in rural America by killing good-paying rural jobs, cutting a gaping hole in the critical farmer safety net and shifting opportunity away from America's small towns with cuts to vital rural development, sustainable conservation, and energy initiatives.

Inexplicably, H.R. 2 fails to address the 52 percent decline in farm income and eliminates the Conservation Stewardship Program, the nation's largest working lands conservation program, by merging it with the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, resulting in \$800 million less for investments in preserving working lands and sustainable farm practices.

The legislation hurts rural families in several additional ways by:

Failing to increase funding for USDA's trade assistance programs that help farmers stay globally competitive through initiatives that help to develop and expand their business in overseas markets;

Abolishing the entire Energy Title, resulting in lost investments in jobs of the future in renewable energy and biofuels;

Adding onerous fees to rural development guaranteed loans;

Curtailling broadband assistance in remote areas by adding administrative burdens and fails to boost USDA's telemedicine initiatives that help combat opioid abuse in rural America;

Underfunding the Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development Program, which provides funding to organizations that educate, mentor and provide technical assistance for new and veteran farmers; and

Betraying the next generation of farm and food leaders by failing to provide mandatory funding for scholarships at 1890 land grant institutions.

This so-called Farm Bill is so bad in so many ways to so many people that it is little wonder that it is strongly opposed by leading organizations and associations from all sides of the political spectrum, including: National Farmers Union, National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition, Environmental Working Group, National Young Farmers Coalition, Union of Concerned Scientists, Agriculture Energy Coalition, American Biogas Association, Institute for Agriculture & Trade Policy, AARP, American Academy of Pediatrics, AFSCME, Alliance for Retired Americans, American Psychological Association, Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), Child Care Aware of America, Child Welfare League of America, Children's Defense Fund, Coalition on Human Needs, Every Child Matters, Families USA, Feeding America, First Focus Campaign for Children, Food Research & Action Center, Hispanic Federation, Lutheran Services in America, Mazon: A Jewish Response to Hunger, Meals on Wheels America, MomsRising, NAACP, National Consumers League, National Council on Aging, National Employment Law Project, National PTA, National Urban League, National Women's Law Center, NOW, Partnership for America's Children, Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law, SEIU, Share Our Strength, UnidosUS, YWCA USA, Heritage Foundation, R Street Institute, and Taxpayers for Common Sense.

I urge all Members to join me in voting to reject the rule and this cruel, heartless legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 900 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

On p. 2, line 2, insert "The amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole." after "purposes."

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:
'Add at the end the following:

Subtitle H Protections From Retaliatory
Tariffs

SEC. 11801. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect until the President transmits a certification to Congress that the following Administration efforts will not result in adverse trade or tariff impacts against U.S. farmers, ranchers, and other agriculture producers:

(1) the renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement;

(2) the application of tariffs and/or quotas on steel and aluminum imports under Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962;

(3) any enforcement action taken pursuant to the investigation into China's acts, policies, and practices related to technology transfer, intellectual property, and innovation under Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974; and

(4) the application of global safeguard tariffs on imports of large residential washing machines and solar cells and modules under Section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974."

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule....When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools

for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting the resolution, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 189, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

YEAS—228

Abraham	Dunn	LaMalfa
Aderholt	Emmer	Lamborn
Allen	Estes (KS)	Lance
Amash	Faso	Latta
Amodei	Ferguson	Lesko
Arrington	Fitzpatrick	Lewis (MN)
Babin	Fleischmann	LoBiondo
Bacon	Flores	Long
Banks (IN)	Fortenberry	Loudermilk
Barletta	Fox	Love
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Barton	Gaetz	Luetkemeyer
Bergman	Gallagher	MacArthur
Biggs	Garrett	Marchant
Bilirakis	Gianforte	Marino
Bishop (MI)	Gibbs	Marshall
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Massie
Black	Gosar	Mast
Blum	Gowdy	McCarthy
Bost	Granger	McCaul
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Brat	Graves (LA)	McHenry
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Brooks (IN)	Griffith	McMorris
Buchanan	Grothman	Rodgers
Buck	Guthrie	McSally
Bucshon	Handel	Meadows
Budd	Harper	Messer
Burgess	Harris	Mitchell
Byrne	Hartzler	Moolenaar
Calvert	Hensarling	Mooney (WV)
Carter (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Mullin
Carter (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse
Chabot	Higgins (LA)	Noem
Cheney	Hill	Norman
Coffman	Holding	Nunes
Cole	Hollingsworth	Olson
Collins (GA)	Hudson	Palazzo
Collins (NY)	Huizenga	Palmer
Comer	Hultgren	Paulsen
Comstock	Hunter	Pearce
Conaway	Hurd	Perry
Cook	Issa	Pittenger
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)
Cramer	Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin
Crawford	Johnson (LA)	Posey
Culberson	Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Reed
Curtis	Jordan	Reichert
Davidson	Joyce (OH)	Renacci
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Rice (SC)
Denham	Kelly (MS)	Roby
DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Donovan	Kinzing	Rokita
Duffy	Knight	Rooney, Francis
Duncan (SC)	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney, Thomas
Duncan (TN)	LaHood	J.

Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)
Roskam	Smith (NJ)
Ross	Smith (TX)
Rothfus	Smucker
Rouzer	Stefanik
Royce (CA)	Stewart
Russell	Stivers
Rutherford	Taylor
Sanford	Tenney
Scalise	Thompson (PA)
Schweikert	Thornberry
Scott, Austin	Tipton
Sensenbrenner	Trott
Sessions	Turner
Shimkus	Upton
Shuster	Valadao
Simpson	Wagner
Smith (MO)	Walberg

NAYS—189

Adams	Gomez
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)
Barragán	Gottheimer
Bass	Green, Al
Beatty	Green, Gene
Bera	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez
Blumenauer	Hanabusa
Blunt Rochester	Hastings
Bonamici	Heck
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins (NY)
F.	Himes
Brady (PA)	Hoyer
Brownley (CA)	Huffman
Bustos	Jackson Lee
Butterfield	Jayapal
Capuano	Jeffries
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN)	Jones
Cartwright	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Keating
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)
Chu, Judy	Kennedy
Cicilline	Khanna
Clark (MA)	Kihuen
Clarke (NY)	Kildee
Clay	Kilmer
Cleaver	Kind
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi
Cohen	Kuster (NH)
Connolly	Lamb
Gaetz	Langevin
Gallagher	Larsen (WA)
Garrett	Larsen (CT)
Gianforte	Lawrence
Gibbs	Lawson (FL)
Goodlatte	Lee
Gosar	Levin
Gowdy	Lewis (GA)
Granger	Lieu, Ted
Graves (GA)	Lipinski
Graves (LA)	Loeb
Graves (MO)	Loeb
Griffith	Loeb
Grothman	Lowenthal
Guthrie	Lowe
Handel	Lujan Grisham,
Harper	M.
Harris	Lujan, Ben Ray
Hartzler	Lynch
Hensarling	Maloney,
Herrera Beutler	Carolyn B.
Hice, Jody B.	Maloney, Sean
Higgins (LA)	Matsui
Hill	McCollum
Holding	McEachin
Hollingsworth	McGovern
Hudson	McNerney
Huizenga	Meeks
Hunt	Meng
Hunter	Moore
Hurd	Moulton
Issa	Murphy (FL)
Jenkins (KS)	Nadler
Jenkins (WV)	Napolitano
Jordan	
Joyce (OH)	
Katko	
Kelly (MS)	
Kelly (PA)	
King (IA)	
King (NY)	
Kinzing	
Knight	
Kustoff (TN)	
LaHood	

NOT VOTING—10

Beyer	Gohmert
Blackburn	Labrador
Brown (MD)	Polis
DeGette	Rogers (KY)

□ 1356

Ms. TSONGAS changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 228, noes 188, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

AYES—228

Abraham	Gosar	Newhouse
Aderholt	Gowdy	Noem
Allen	Granger	Norman
Amash	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Olson
Arrington	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Babin	Griffith	Palmer
Bacon	Grothman	Paulsen
Banks (IN)	Guthrie	Pearce
Barletta	Handel	Perry
Barr	Harper	Pittenger
Barton	Harris	Poe (TX)
Bergman	Hartzler	Poliquin
Biggs	Hensarling	Posey
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Higgins (LA)	Reichert
Blum	Hill	Renacci
Bost	Holding	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Hollingsworth	Roby
Brat	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hunter	Rokita
Buck	Hurd	Rooney, Francis
Bucshon	Issa	Rooney, Thomas
Budd	Jenkins (KS)	J.
Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Carter (TX)	Jones	Rouzer
Chabot	Jordan	Royce (CA)
Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Russell
Coffman	Katko	Rutherford
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Sanford
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Schweikert
Comer	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Comstock	Kinzing	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Knight	Sessions
Cook	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
Costello (PA)	LaHood	Shuster
Cramer	LaMalfa	Simpson
Crawford	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Culberson	Lance	Smith (NE)
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Curtis	Lesko	Smith (TX)
Davidson	Lewis (MN)	Smucker
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Stefanik
Denham	Long	Stewart
DeSantis	Loudermilk	Stivers
DesJarlais	Love	Taylor
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Tenney
Donovan	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	MacArthur	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Trott
Dunn	Marshall	Turner
Emmer	Massie	Upton
Estes (KS)	Mast	Valadao
Faso	McCarthy	Wagner
Ferguson	McCaul	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Walden
Fleischmann	McHenry	Walker
Flores	McKinley	Walorski
Fortenberry	McMorris	Walters, Mimi
Fox	Rodgers	Weber (TX)
Frelinghuysen	McSally	Wenstrup
Gaetz	Meadows	Westerman
Gallagher	Messer	Williams
Garrett	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Wittman
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Goodlatte	Mullin	

Woodall	Yoho	Young (IA)
Yoder	Young (AK)	Zeldin
NOES—188		
Adams	Gomez	Nolan
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Barragán	Gottheimer	O'Halleran
Bass	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Beatty	Green, Gene	Pallone
Bera	Grijalva	Panetta
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Payne
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Pelosi
Bonamici	Heck	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins (NY)	Peters
F.	Himes	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Pingree
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Pocan
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jayapal	Quigley
Capuano	Jeffries	Raskin
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rosen
Cartwright	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Rush
Cicilline	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clay	Kind	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Cohen	Lamb	Schrader
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Correa	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costa	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Shea-Porter
Crist	Lee	Sherman
Crowley	Levin	Sinema
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Soto
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Speier
DeFazio	Lofgren	Suoizzi
DeLaney	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Lowe y	Takano
DelBene	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (CA)
Demings	M.	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
Deutch	Lynch	Tonko
Dingell	Maloney,	Torres
Doggett	Carolyn B.	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
F.	Matsui	Veasey
Ellison	McCollum	Vela
Engel	McEachin	Velázquez
Eshoo	McGovern	Visclosky
Espallat	McNerney	Wasserman
Esty (CT)	Meeks	Schultz
Evans	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Moore	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Welch
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Nadler	Yarmuth
Gallego	Napolitano	
Garamendi	Neal	

NOT VOTING—11

Beyer	DeGette	Rogers (KY)
Black	Gohmert	Walz
Blackburn	Labrador	Webster (FL)
Brown (MD)	Polis	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1404

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESSIONAL SPORTSMEN'S CAUCUS

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, and it is the largest bipartisan and bicameral caucus in the United States Congress.

Every year we have an annual congressional shootout, which consists of sporting clays, trap, and skeet shotgunning, and it is a competition between Republican Members of Congress who are members of the Sportsmen's Caucus and Democratic Members of Congress who are members of the Sportsmen's Caucus.

This year, we had 28 shooters, and I am pleased to say that the Republican team once again retained the trophy for another year.

We also had some individual competitions going on, and I would like to recognize those Members of Congress.

The Top Gun Member of Congress this year goes to Representative JOHN RUTHERFORD from Florida. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was his first time at this event, and he had the second highest score for a Member of Congress since the year 2010. He shot 61 out of a total possible 75.

We also had a Top Gun Republican Member, RICHARD HUDSON from North Carolina.

We had a Top Gun Democrat. That was Representative MIKE THOMPSON from California, who always shoots well. I like shooting against him.

Of course, I won the Top Skeet Award. DUNCAN HUNTER from California won the Top Trap, and the Top Sporting Clays was Representative AUSTIN SCOTT, who is also the co-vice chair on the Republican side for the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus.

Now, the caucus is made up of two chairmen, one Republican and one Democrat, and two co-vice chairmen, one Republican and one Democrat. I would like to take this opportunity to yield to the co-chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we only had four Democrats shooting. Somewhere along the way, we have to do better recruitment. You and I both know we are term limited as co-chairs, and my replacement next year will be another Texan.

Where is my Texan?

Okay. Congressman Mark Veasey, and I know he shot better than I did, so maybe he will improve our lot next time. It is a lot of fun, the camaraderie is great, and I just am honored to have that time to be the vice chair, now the co-chair of it, and so thank you.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, and I want to invite all Members of Congress to join the Sportsmen's Caucus. It is not just about hunting and fishing. It is about access to outdoor property that we own as taxpayers. Public access is important. It is about trapping. It is about a lot of other outdoor activities that we can take advantage of.

The sporting clay competition that we had is open to all Members, from be-

ginner to expert. Come out and enjoy the day next year about this same time, and enjoy a day out in Maryland at the Prince George's Trap and Skeet Center gun range club. It is a great afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, this trophy will reside in my office, 2229 Rayburn House Office Building if anybody wants to come by and admire it. It will have a new plaque saying the Republicans won the 2018 competition.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 188, answered “present” 2, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—217

Abraham	Davis (CA)	Hunter
Aderholt	Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)
Allen	Davis, Rodney	Johnson (LA)
Amodei	DeLauro	Johnson, Sam
Arrington	DelBene	Jones
Bacon	Demings	Katko
Banks (IN)	DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)
Barletta	Deutch	Kennedy
Barr	Dingell	Kildee
Barton	Doggett	King (IA)
Beatty	Donovan	King (NY)
Billakis	Duffy	Krishnamoorthi
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (TN)	Kuster (NH)
Blum	Dunn	Kustoff (TN)
Blumenauer	Ellison	LaMalfa
Blunt Rochester	Engel	Lamborn
Bonamici	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Brady (TX)	Estes (KS)	Latta
Brat	Evans	Lawrence
Brooks (IN)	Ferguson	Lesko
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Lewis (MN)
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Lipinski
Budd	Foster	Long
Bustos	Frankel (FL)	Loudermilk
Butterfield	Frelinghuysen	Love
Byrne	Gabbard	Lucas
Carson (IN)	Gallego	Luetkemeyer
Carter (TX)	Garamendi	Lujan Grisham,
Cartwright	Garrett	M.
Castro (TX)	Gianforte	Luján, Ben Ray
Chabot	Gibbs	Marino
Chu, Judy	Goodlatte	Massie
Cicilline	Gowdy	McCarthy
Clay	Granger	McCaul
Cole	Griffith	McClintock
Collins (GA)	Guthrie	McCollum
Collins (NY)	Handel	McEachin
Comstock	Harper	McHenry
Cook	Harris	McMorris
Cooper	Heck	Rodgers
Cramer	Hensarling	McNerney
Crawford	Higgins (LA)	Meadows
Cuellar	Himes	Meeks
Culberson	Hollingsworth	Meng
Cummings	Huffman	Messer
Curtis	Huizenga	Mitchell
Davidson	Hultgren	Moolenaar

Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Nadler
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norman
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Posey
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ross

Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart

Suoizzi
Takano
Thornberry
Titus
Trott
Tsongas
Valadao
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoho
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—20

Beyer
Biggs
Black
Blackburn
Brown (MD)
Calvert
DeFazio
DeGette
Faso
Gohmert
Issa
Labrador
Polis
Raskin
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Roskam
Walz
Webster (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1417

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3562. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish assistance for adaptations of residences of veterans in rehabilitation programs under chapter 31 of such title, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4009. An act to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct a central parking facility on National Zoological Park property in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2772. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for requirements relating to the reassignment of Department of Veterans Affairs senior executive employees.

H.R. 3249. An act to authorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2349. An act to direct the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to establish an interagency working group to study Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence and to make recommendations on the harmonization of such efforts, and for other purposes.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION
ACT OF 2018

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2.

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 House Resolution 891 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in

the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1419

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEBER of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 16, 2018, amendment No. 9 printed in part C of House Report 115-677 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. HERRERA
BEUTLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 487, after line 4, insert the following:
(d) STEWARDSHIP PROJECT RECEIPTS.—Section 604(e) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591c(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting “subject to paragraph (3)(A),” before “shall”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “services received by the Chief or the Director” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “services and in-kind resources received by the Chief or the Director under a stewardship contract project conducted under this section shall not be considered monies received from the National Forest System or the public lands, but any payments made by the contractor to the Chief or Director under the project shall be considered monies received from the National Forest System or the public lands.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman CONAWAY for the opportunity to speak on this important amendment that I am offering to the farm bill today.

I also want to thank my colleague, Congressman WESTERMAN, for his tireless work on behalf of our rural communities that are dependent on timber.

Mr. Chairman, the key takeaway here is simple: If moneys are generated during restorative work in our forests, then a portion of those moneys generated from that work ought to remain in the community.

NAYS—188

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Babin
Barragán
Bass
Bera
Bergman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Burgess
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Cheney
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clever
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Diaz-Balart
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (SC)
Emmer
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foxx
Fudge
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger
Knight
LaHood
Lamb
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McGovern
McKinley
McSally
Moore
Murphy (FL)

Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Halloran
Pallone
Panetta
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Price (NC)
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Sires
Soto
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Torres
Turner
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Watson Coleman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Zeldin

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Rice (SC) Tonko

Traditional timber sales require that a quarter of the revenues stay in the local county. But when the U.S. Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management use what is called stewardship contracts to work in the forests, none of those proceeds remain locally.

Our forested counties are facing a financial crisis right now. Federal endangered species listings have left timber-dependent counties in southwest Washington with little to no revenue from timber sales.

In counties that are primarily federally owned, like Skamania County in my district, which is 97-percent owned by the government, they are unable to make up these drastically reduced revenues from property taxes. This means that, by no fault of their own, they lack the local tax base to support even the most basic needs of their local communities, like schools or roads or local fire and police.

To help make up some of that revenue, Congress created the Secure Rural Schools program in 2000. Unfortunately, despite my and my colleagues' persistent effort to find a long-term solution through SRS, we cannot keep relying on the Federal Government's short-term fixes. That is not doing right by these communities.

This commonsense amendment will empower desperately needed funds to stay in local communities. Individuals and families should not be victim to Federal dysfunction. Let's not allow a Federal contracting program for timber harvest and forest restoration to leave those neighboring communities empty-handed.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment to ensure that a portion of the proceeds from these contracts are being rightfully directed to timber counties.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER) for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is at the desk directs a portion of revenue from stewardship contracting toward individual counties for further investment in roads, schools, and the like.

This amendment has no effect on in-kind contributions or exchanges of timber for goods or services provided. This amendment only affects the rare instance where stewardship contracts are exchanged for cash.

Per the 1908 Forest Service revenue-sharing law, counties are entitled to 25 percent of all timber receipts sold from Federal lands within their borders. This amendment simply ensures that if it looks like a timber sale, where timber is exchanged for cash, counties receive the same share they would if the Forest Service had sold the timber outright.

The argument that this amendment siphons off money from the Forest Service is false. This amendment does not affect or reduce the reinvestment from in-kind contributions. Furthermore, little investment can be made in our Nation's forest at all if there are no local communities to cultivate the investment.

This amendment ensures that counties can continue to invest in their forests and their children's future, both by protecting the good work of stewardship contracting and by ensuring that our rural counties get their fair share.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support a fair share for rural communities.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8331 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 8331. GOOD NEIGHBOR AGREEMENTS.

Section 8206 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (16 U.S.C. 2113a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking "Secretary or a Governor" and inserting "Secretary, Governor, county, or Indian Tribe";

(B) in paragraph (4) by striking "Secretary and a Governor" and inserting "Secretary and a Governor, county, or an Indian Tribe";

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(10) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian Tribe' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)."

"(11) COUNTY.—The term 'county' has the meaning given the term in section 2 of title 1, United States Code."; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting "county, or an Indian Tribe" after "Governor"; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting "county, or an Indian Tribe" after "Governor".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment that will empower local communities by allowing counties to be included in Good Neighbor Authority cooperative agreements and contracts in order to improve forest health and bolster watershed restoration.

The base farm bill reauthorizes Good Neighbor Authority through fiscal year

2023 and contains a provision that allows tribal governments to be eligible to enter into Good Neighbor Authority cooperative agreements and contracts. Our amendment simply builds on that commonsense provision by also authorizing counties to be eligible for Good Neighbor Authority.

Good Neighbor Authority projects have been remarkably successful. From 2002 to 2013, 63 projects treated more than 4,100 acres in Colorado and Utah. These worthwhile treatments mitigated the threat of catastrophic wildfire, reduced flooding, enhanced forest health, and improved water quality.

Counties on both sides of the aisle requested this amendment and new authority.

The problem in Coconino County, a liberal county represented by my colleague Mr. O'HALLERAN, is that the wood is low-value timber, so they can't attract private industry to thin their forest for pending work they need completed.

Counties want to do this type of work themselves or find a contractor if the Federal Government won't treat their forests. All that is missing is the authorization from Congress.

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources is already entering into cooperative agreements with counties to partner in the management of Wisconsin County Forests, and it is working for them as well.

Some counties have actual foresters or other land management professionals on staff. These are not limited specifically to large counties either. For example, Adams County, Idaho, population of 4,000, has a natural resources committee that is chaired by a retired Forest Service employee who also serves on the local forest collaborative.

Coconino County has a forest restoration director who would be in charge of these county Good Neighbor Authority agreements. This is a director-level executive position that reports directly to the deputy county manager.

While some counties will likely contract with outside entities to perform the work, county contracts will be overseen by someone such as an auditor or a clerk.

The National Association of Counties supports this amendment, stating, "NACo stands ready to work with you to promote locally supported, consensus-driven solutions to address forest management challenges and reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire. NACo encourages the United States House of Representatives to adopt your amendment to H.R. 2 and give counties the opportunity to assist our Federal partners to make our national forests healthy again."

In addition to NACo, I am also honored to have the support of the National Water Resources Association, the Arizona Association of Conservation Districts, the Salt River Project, the Colorado Pork Producers Council,

and more than 20 other local and national organizations and elected officials.

I urge all of my colleagues in the House to support this commonsense amendment that will empower bipartisan communities throughout the country, improve forest health, and bolster watershed restoration.

Again, this is an authorization, not a requirement. It puts more power into the hands of local communities who need the work done but have nowhere to turn under the status quo.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), my good friend and colleague, who is a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment I cosponsored with Representative GOSAR that will expand the Good Neighbor Authority for counties.

Good Neighbor Authority allows the Forest Service to enter into cooperative agreements and contracts with States and Puerto Rico to execute projects that perform watershed restoration and forest management services on National Forest System lands.

The current text of the farm bill includes language to expand the Good Neighbor Authority to include Indian Tribes. This simple amendment seeks to build on that commonsense provision by empowering local communities and allowing the Forest Service to include counties as partners to these agreements.

□ 1430

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. GOSAR for offering this commonsense amendment.

Good Neighbor Authority was one of the hard-fought achievements in the 2014 farm bill that has proven useful in improving our national forests and our rural communities. I was pleased to expand the Good Neighbor Authority to Indian Tribes in the base text of this bill, and I am happy that my colleague continues to improve the forestry title with this amendment authorizing counties to be eligible.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. GIANFORTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of part III of subtitle C of title VIII, insert the following:

SEC. 83. SALVAGE AND REFORESTATION IN RESPONSE TO CATASTROPHIC EVENTS.

(a) EXPEDITED SALVAGE OPERATIONS AND REFORESTATION ACTIVITIES FOLLOWING LARGE-SCALE CATASTROPHIC EVENTS.—

(1) EXPEDITED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an environmental assessment prepared by the Secretary concerned pursuant to section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) for a salvage operation or reforestation activity proposed to be conducted on National Forest System lands or public lands adversely impacted by a large-scale catastrophic event shall be completed within 60 days after the conclusion of the catastrophic event.

(2) EXPEDITED IMPLEMENTATION AND COMPLETION.—In the case of reforestation activities conducted on National Forest System lands or public lands adversely impacted by a large-scale catastrophic event, the Secretary concerned shall, to the maximum extent practicable, achieve reforestation of at least 75 percent of the impacted lands during the 5-year period following the conclusion of the catastrophic event.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF KNUTSON-VANDENBERG FUNDS.—Amounts in the special fund established pursuant to section 3 of the Act of June 9, 1930 (commonly known as the Knutson-Vandenberg Act; 16 U.S.C. 576b) shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for reforestation activities authorized by this section.

(4) TIMELINE FOR PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of a salvage operation or reforestation activity proposed to be conducted on National Forest System lands or public lands adversely impacted by a large-scale catastrophic event, the Secretary concerned shall allow 30 days for public scoping and comment, 15 days for filing an objection, and 15 days for the agency response to the filing of an objection. Upon completion of this process and expiration of the period specified in paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned shall implement the project immediately.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH FOREST PLAN.—A salvage operation or reforestation activity authorized by this section shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the forest plan applicable to the National Forest System lands or public lands covered by the salvage operation or reforestation activity.

(c) PROHIBITION ON RESTRAINING ORDERS, PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS, AND INJUNCTIONS PENDING APPEAL.—No restraining order, preliminary injunction, or injunction pending appeal shall be issued by any court of the United States with respect to any decision to prepare or conduct a salvage operation or reforestation activity in response to a large-scale catastrophic event. Section 705 of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to any challenge to the salvage operation or reforestation activity.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

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

Mr. Chair, my amendment would allow land management agencies like

the U.S. Forest Service and BLM to quickly remove dead trees after wildfires to pay for reforestation and rehabilitation after devastating fires.

Last year, over 1 million acres burned in Montana. Livelihoods were threatened, wildlife habitats were destroyed, and whole landscapes were scarred.

My commonsense amendment was passed, verbatim, in the Resilient Federal Forests Act by this body. It would allow the agencies to quickly respond, as well as to raise funds to further rehabilitate the forest. An expedited environmental assessment would still be required and public input would still be included in order to move forward with the project. Most importantly, this amendment would require that at least 75 percent of the burned area would be reforested.

These landscape scale projects are badly needed. The Rice Ridge fire burned over 160,000 acres alone. Quickly responding to the damage caused will protect our public lands and restore our watersheds for the future and restore them to the quality we have come to love in Montana.

As I mentioned, similar language was included in the Resilient Federal Forests Act, which passed the House on a bipartisan basis on November 11, 2017.

My amendment is supported by the Federal Forest Resource Coalition, the National Association of Counties, the National Water Resources Association, and the Idaho Forest Group.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my good friend and colleague Congressman GIANFORTE's wildfire salvage operations amendment. I am glad that, with the farm bill package, we have the opportunity to look at the forest industry and wildfire issues from all sides.

This amendment is part and parcel of a broader wildfire strategy that requires proactive action from Congress for the steps before, during, and after wildfires are expected. Specifically, this amendment will ensure that the National Forest System forest is cleared and replanted if a catastrophic wildfire chars it to the ground.

Our National Forest System lands will be rehabilitated after wildfire devastates them, but in a way consistent with forest plans. That way, the ecosystem of the new forest will have better management and be less susceptible to another large-scale burn-down event.

This is a forward-thinking amendment to fix a backwards system we have devised in Congress, and I urge Members to vote for this demonstration that shows Congress isn't willing to just give up and let our forest system lands be catastrophically burnt.

Mr. Chair, I applaud Representative GIANFORTE for his strong leadership and tireless efforts to reduce the threat of dangerous wildfires. I urge adoption of this commonsense amendment.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Mr. GIANFORTE for offering this important amendment for Montana and, quite frankly, for our National Forest System as a whole.

Over the past several years, fires have had a devastating impact on our forest system lands, resulting in deteriorated landscapes. I have witnessed this firsthand across the country as the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture's Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry.

It is vital that the Forest Service has the right tools, the ability to restore these landscapes as quickly as possible to preserve habitat, clean air, and the significant impact that these incidents can have on clean water.

Unfortunately, litigation stalls many of these projects. As Madison County, Montana, Commissioner Dave Schulz noted before the House Natural Resources Federal Lands Subcommittee in May of 2015, due to the threat of litigation from outside groups refusing to meet or collaborate with the community, what started out as a consensus proposal for 100,000 acres of fire salvage and reforestation was reduced to less than 2,000 acres of salvage. "Fear of litigation prevents the Forest Service from thinking big."

In another quote, he offered, a "significant factor in preventing responsible management of our Nation's forests."

Mr. Chair, I certainly support this amendment. It has already passed the House. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chair, at this time, I urge adoption of my common-sense amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of part III of subtitle C of title VIII, insert the following:

SEC. 8334. ANALYSIS OF ONLY TWO ALTERNATIVES (ACTION VERSUS NO ACTION) IN PROPOSED COLLABORATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) APPLICATION TO CERTAIN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.—This section shall apply whenever the Secretary concerned prepares an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement pursuant to

section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) for a forest management activity that—

(1) is developed through a collaborative process;

(2) is proposed by a resource advisory committee;

(3) will occur on lands identified by the Secretary concerned as suitable for timber production;

(4) will occur on lands designated by the Secretary (or designee thereof) pursuant to section 602(b) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591a(b)), notwithstanding whether such forest management activity is initiated prior to September 30, 2018; or

(5) is covered by a community wildfire protection plan.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES.—In an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement described in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned shall study, develop, and describe only the following two alternatives:

(1) The forest management activity.

(2) The alternative of no action.

(c) ELEMENTS OF NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE.—In the case of the alternative of no action, the Secretary concerned shall consider whether to evaluate—

(1) the effect of no action on—

(A) forest health;

(B) habitat diversity;

(C) wildfire potential;

(D) insect and disease potential; and

(E) timber production; and

(2) the implications of a resulting decline in forest health, loss of habitat diversity, wildfire, or insect or disease infestation, given fire and insect and disease historic cycles, on—

(A) domestic water supply in the project area;

(B) wildlife habitat loss; and

(C) other economic and social factors.

SEC. 8335. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.

(a) BALANCING SHORT- AND LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES IN CONSIDERING INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—As part of its weighing the equities while considering any request for an injunction that applies to any agency action as part of a forest management activity the court reviewing the agency action shall balance the impact to the ecosystem likely affected by the forest management activity of—

(1) the short- and long-term effects of undertaking the agency action; against

(2) the short- and long-term effects of not undertaking the action.

(b) TIME LIMITATIONS FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2) the length of any preliminary injunctive relief and stays pending appeal that applies to any agency action as part of a forest management activity, shall not exceed 60 days.

(2) RENEWAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A court of competent jurisdiction may issue one or more renewals of any preliminary injunction, or stay pending appeal, granted under paragraph (1).

(B) UPDATES.—In each renewal of an injunction in an action, the parties to the action shall present the court with updated information on the status of the authorized forest management activity.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

Mr. Chair, my amendment promotes collaborative forest management, cuts red tape, and encourages the Forest Service to plan for the long-term health of our Nation's forests.

Mr. Chair, if we were to go to the doctor and we had cancer and the doctor offered a treatment for that cancer but decided it might not be in our best interests, we wouldn't just leave. We would want to find out what the best treatment was.

What is happening in our national forests is, if one plan is rejected, we do nothing, and we don't treat the disease of mismanagement that is currently happening in our forests.

Implementing sound, scientifically-based management reforms is necessary to address the growing economic and environmental threats of catastrophic wildfire. Prevention through active management is the best medicine to make our forests healthy.

By requiring environmental analysis of a collaboratively developed proposal to be weighed against a "no action" alternative—the impacts of doing nothing on forest health and wildfire risk—this amendment ensures that taxpayer dollars are spent only on analysis and project planning that protects our forests' long-term health. Further, my amendment ensures that long-term forest health is considered by the courts when granting an injunction on critical forest management activities.

This amendment previously received bipartisan support in the House as part of the Resilient Federal Forests Act. It has no cost to the American taxpayer and is supported by a variety of organizations, including the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of Home Builders, and more.

Mr. Chair, inaction itself is a forest management decision. Standing by and doing nothing is the reason we continue to watch our forests burn.

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, this amendment significantly alters critical environmental review requirements and limits opportunity for the public to challenge forest management projects.

Restricting NEPA analysis to two alternatives may seem like it will save time and money, but this cuts right at the heart of critical environmental protections. NEPA doesn't hurt forest management projects; bad planning, ignoring science, and disingenuous intentions hurt forest management projects.

NEPA supports collaboration through public participation. It allows many voices and different voices to participate in the planning process,

which leads to better results and reduced costs.

NEPA ensures Federal agencies consider all alternatives, without requiring that agencies select the most environmentally friendly option or value the environment over other concerns.

Much like the forestry provisions in the base text of this bill, we have been down this road before. House Republicans tried to include harmful provisions to scale bedrock environmental laws and restrict access to the courts during the omnibus negotiations.

All of these toxic proposals were rejected by the Senate. Let's not make the Senate say "no" for a second time.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, this bill, again, does not sidestep any environmental activity. It just simply says that we have to evaluate the do-nothing option and what the effects to the forest are from that.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my good friend and colleague, Mr. WESTERMAN.

The United States is about to embark on yet another year of ravaging catastrophic wildfire. I say "embark" because this is ultimately a choice. While some amount of summer wildfire is to be expected during the heat of summer, the devastation we have seen in recent years is unprecedented.

2017 was one of the worst wildfire seasons on record. More than 58,000 fires burned more than 9.2 million acres. The Forest Service spent more than \$2.5 billion on suppression costs this fiscal year alone, a new record.

These expenditures and destruction coincide perfectly with Congress' dereliction of its duty to ensure our land management agencies are equipped with the tools and authorities to properly manage our forests. Congress has provided some legislative fixes this year, but I think every Member understands full well we shouldn't pat ourselves on the back just yet.

As the coming months will demonstrate, we and, by extension, the American taxpayer are still on the hook here. We are susceptible to years more of supermassive fire blanketing the country unless we build on our progress.

Mr. WESTERMAN's amendment here does just that. It will require the government to holistically evaluate the impacts of its forestry decisions on overall forest health. By requiring the costs of inaction to be weighed, the Forest Service will have to demonstrate its decisions are ultimately in a forest's interest.

Mr. Chair, I applaud Mr. WESTERMAN for his strong leadership and tireless efforts to improve a failing system that we have inherited.

Mr. Chair, I urge the adoption of the commonsense amendment.

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

Mr. Chair, if my colleagues across the aisle are serious about the long-term health of our forests, they should stop and pause and listen to scientists, who tell us climate change threatens in a very factual and scientific way and direct way the health of our forests, wildlife, and the ever-increasing forest fires that we must confront every year. We can use NEPA as a tool to consider these impacts, and if we are smart, we will strengthen the law instead of weakening it piece by piece.

The issue of forest health is a serious issue. This amendment does not deal with the complexity of the seriousness of this issue. If, indeed, we are to deal with this issue, then it has to be comprehensive and it has to be looked at, not by eliminating protections and public access, but by truly doing something for the long-term health of these forests, and that is to consider all available information and not deny scientific information in the process of blaming NEPA or any other law that exists for the public and for the protection of our forests as the reason why we are having forest fires.

Forest fires are a direct result of climate change, and as such, not to consider that as part and parcel of a solution is a grave mistake that will not solve the problem.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment. It should not be tucked into this farm bill. It merits its own proper discussion and debate in this House, and that is the direction we should go.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, this amendment does not sidestep NEPA, it does not weaken NEPA, it just simply says you have to evaluate the alternative of doing nothing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I think that we have actually found some common ground when our colleague is saying, let's use science.

Effectively, that is what we are talking about with this amendment, to be able to have analysis, to be able to have project planning.

Let me give you a real-life example in southwestern Colorado: the West Fork Complex fire, which erupted because we had trees growing not at the elevation that they should, overgrowth in our forest that resulted in a massive fire.

I would suggest that if you care about endangered species, if you care about protecting our waterways, if you care about having an abundant resource to be able to develop to be able to support our schools through the rural school programs as well, this is an opportunity to be able to create those healthy forests and to be able to

move forward with good commonsense planning that is going to be provided by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage the passage of the amendment and applaud Mr. WESTERMAN's efforts on this.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this amendment ensures that we prioritize the long-term health of our forest and we equip the Forest Service with the tools they need to execute a plan.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the sustained health of our Nation's forests, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of part III of subtitle C of title VIII, insert the following:

SEC. 83. APPLICATION OF ROADLESS AREA CONSERVATION RULE.

The roadless area conservation rule established under part 294 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), shall not apply to any National Forest System land in the State of Alaska.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. The Clinton era Roadless Rule applies a one-size-fits-all approach to areas where those policies rarely work, especially the federally locked lands in Alaska.

At 16.8 million acres, the Tongass National Forest is the largest of the National Forest System. Coupled with the Chugach National Forest, Alaska contains 12 percent of the total acres of national forest lands in the total United States.

The Roadless Rule is nothing more than another effort to end the multiple-use mandate of Federal forest

lands, something that is required by law but often ignored by nameless, faceless, unelected bureaucrats.

Although the Tongass is over 100 years old, only 400,000 acres have been harvested. Of the remaining acreage, much of the forest is not topographically suitable for timber harvest, and 6.6 million acres are congressionally designated as wilderness areas, national monuments, and roadless areas.

Not only does the Roadless Rule violate the authorities granted under the Alaska National Lands Act, it was adopted without proper consultation or consideration of the countless communities that rely on responsible resource development.

Nearly 96 percent of the Tongass National Forest and 99 percent of the Chugach National Forest are protected by ANILCA and forest management plans.

Exempting Alaska from the Roadless Rule would help make certain that what is left of the timber industry in the southeast can survive.

Many individuals adamantly oppose logging old growth in roadless areas. However, old growth will continue to be predominant in the Tongass, and given the remote nature of Alaska, the vast majority of the forest is in a roadless state.

Over 90 percent of the Tongass is inaccessible by road. The lack of access to timber not only costs good-paying jobs, but results in trees dying of disease and infestations. Dead trees serve no purpose other than to become kindling, creating fires. So by having a robust timber industry, we can help prevent the spread of serious wildfires like have been seen in the lower 48.

To be clear, we are not talking about clearcutting the entire national forest. We just want to help it stay healthy and fulfill its multi-use mandate of the Tongass.

By significantly limiting the areas that are eligible for harvesting, the implementation of the Roadless Rule actually makes conservation more difficult since locations with less conservation value often can't be selected.

If any reasonable form of timber industry is to exist in the near future, it is imperative we restore Alaska's exemption from the Roadless Rule as quickly as possible. It has placed an undue burden on my State and the people of my State.

Mr. Chairman, we worry about immigration. We worry about homelessness. We worry about employment. We worry about education. I am saying this Roadless Rule takes away the opportunity for people to supply for their family so they can have a sustainable silviculture industry taking care of our forests in southeast Alaska. The Roadless Rule should have never applied to Alaska to begin with.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment exempts all national forests in Alaska from the Forest Service's Roadless Rule, one of the country's most important conservation safeguards.

Inventoried roadless areas account for only 2 percent of our Nation's land mass, but they provide invaluable benefits: clean drinking water for over 60 million Americans, wildlife habitats for numerous threatened and endangered species, and they act as critical carbon sinks that mitigate the impacts of climate change. All of these benefits are threatened by this amendment.

Nationwide, the Roadless Rule is incredibly popular. Our constituents understand the importance of keeping intact roadless areas and managing our last truly wild places in a manner that protects old-growth forest and other precious resources from the pressures of development and extraction.

It is not just people in the lower 48. Alaskans understand the importance of protecting the roadless landscape. That is why hundreds of businesses in southeast Alaska have joined together to oppose overturning the recently adopted Tongass Forest Plan and efforts like this amendment to overturn protection for roadless areas.

These businesses rely on clean water and healthy forests to support thriving salmon populations and a robust tourist economy. By rolling back safeguards that protect old-growth forests from harmful development, this amendment threatens fundamental linchpins of the regional economy.

The Roadless Rule is not a job killer, as some make it out to be, because the Tongass Forest Plan balances protections of the old-growth forest by allowing public roads, hydropower projects, utility connectors, and access to inholdings, including mines. So its application in Alaska does not adversely affect community access or economic development projects in the legitimate public interest.

An exception for Alaska is a major policy change that hasn't had a hearing or any other form of consideration in the House. This controversial provision shouldn't be stuck in this farm bill without any accountability to the American public.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, just simply, I support the gentleman's amendment. It is common sense. It allows Alaskans to do a better job of taking care of Alaska, and I trust them to make that happen.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment and urge adoption.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, the comments from the other side of the aisle were talking about Alaskans opposing this amendment.

With all due respect, I am an elected representative, and if they don't like what I do, they don't vote for me. I just believe in jobs.

When I first got elected to this job, when I first started this Tongass battle, we had 15,000 jobs in Alaska in the timber industry in the Tongass. And through the National Land Act itself, we were told that no other jobs would be lost in the timber industry, and they slowly crept around and eliminated what remaining jobs occurred. And the sad part about it, from my point of view, they have killed the timber industry. That was not the intent. We were supposed to have a timber industry.

Then along comes the Clinton era Roadless Rule that means you can't build a road anywhere that has no road. How do you have a hydropower site? We had to fight for 4 years to get a hydropower site.

This action here by an administration—this and past administrations—have to understand, this is about employment. This is about managing—managing—timber. And those who don't want to manage anything, you destroy it.

Mr. Chairman, I am urging this body, this Congress, to do what is right for the State of Alaska and right for the timber, and the right for the people that live there and that depend upon a source of income other than living off, very frankly, somebody giving them something. They want to work for it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, Alaska recently lost in Federal court on this very issue. The Supreme Court refused to hear the State's appeal of a ruling that struck down the Tongass exemption. This ended the case.

This amendment attempts to run around that ruling and would exempt Alaska from protections that are widely supported and intended to protect our pristine public lands.

With regard to the Roadless Rule, if the very important and significant issues we confront, whether it is immigration, whether it is employment, whether it is education, the issues of poverty and hunger in this country, I would suggest that the cause for not finding solutions rests in this Chamber, it doesn't rest with the Roadless Rule.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . CONVEYANCE OF LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS TO THE VILLAGE OF SANTA CLARA, NEW MEXICO.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—Subject to the provisions of this section, if the Village of Santa Clara, New Mexico, submits to the Secretary a written request for conveyance, the Secretary shall convey to the Village of Santa Clara all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 1,520 acres of National Forest System land, as generally depicted on the map.

(b) MAP.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be kept on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate office of the Forest Service.

(2) CORRECTION OF ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct minor errors in the map.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance of land under subsection (a), the Village of Santa Clara shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the market value of the land, as determined by the appraisal under subsection (g).

(2) INSTALLMENTS.—The amount described in paragraph (1) may be paid in periodic installments to the Secretary.

(3) PARCEL CONVEYANCES.—Upon receipt of an installment pursuant to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall convey to the Village of Santa Clara all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of the land described subsection (a) that is equal in value to such installment and identified by the Village of Santa Clara at the time such installment is paid.

(d) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) subject to valid existing rights;

(2) made by quitclaim deed;

(3) subject to the reservation by the Secretary of an access easement over and across Fort Bayard Road; and

(4) subject to any other terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(e) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—As a condition for the conveyance under subsection (a) and in addition to the consideration paid under subsection (c), the Village of Santa Clara shall pay for all costs associated with the conveyance, including for—

(1) the land survey under subsection (f);

(2) any environmental analysis and resource surveys determined necessary by Federal law; and

(3) the appraisal under subsection (g).

(f) SURVEY.—The actual acreage and legal description of the National Forest System land to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary; notwithstanding section 7 of title 43, United States Code, the Secretary is authorized to perform and approve any required cadastral surveys.

(g) APPRAISAL.—The Secretary shall complete an appraisal of the land to be conveyed under subsection (a) in accordance with—

(1) the “Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions”; and

(2) the “Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice”.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(2) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Village of Santa Clara Conveyance Act 2018” and dated February 21, 2018.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

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

Mr. Chair, this amendment deals with a small community that is kind of circled around by the Gila National Forest.

This amendment basically is going to allow the Forest Service to sell parcels of Forest Service land to the village of Santa Clara. It is a small village. About 2,000 people live in it. They, like many of our mountain communities, like many of our communities in the Forest Service, are slowly starving to death.

The land that the Forest Service would sell to them is adjacent to the village. It is not a part of the larger national forest. It is just an isolated parcel. The Forest Service does not want to manage this land.

It is in the state that it is in because it was set apart back in 1869 as a part of the Fort Bayard Military Reservation. Because the land is reserved as a military post, it cannot be disposed of in the normal fashion by the Forest Service. They must be released by law.

Back in 1968, there was a bill that released other parcels of Fort Bayard to be sold and to be distributed to the State. This parcel just was not included in that for some reason, so the amendment steps around and includes that now to where the Forest Service would be allowed to dispose of the land.

It would have to be appraised. It would be sold through normal processes. It is just that it requires a law to do it. It cannot go any other way.

The village is desperately in need of expansion room. Like I said, this Forest Service land butts up against the village and stops their growth, stops their economic potential, and it is a very key piece of property for the village, but it is not a key piece of property for the Forest Service.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this non-controversial amendment, and I urge its adoption.

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

□ 1500

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 8506. STREAMLINING THE FOREST SERVICE PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATION APPLICATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY.—The term “communications facility” includes—

(A) any infrastructure, including any transmitting device, tower, or support structure, and any equipment, switches, wiring, cabling, power sources, shelters, or cabinets, associated with the licensed or permitted unlicensed wireless or wireline transmission of writings, signs, signals, data, images, pictures, and sounds of all kinds; and

(B) any antenna or apparatus that—

(i) is designed for the purpose of emitting radio frequency;

(ii) is designed to be operated, or is operating, from a fixed location pursuant to authorization by the Federal Communications Commission or is using duly authorized devices that do not require individual licenses; and

(iii) is added to a tower, building, or other structure.

(2) COMMUNICATIONS SITE.—The term “communications site” means an area of covered land designated for communications uses.

(3) COMMUNICATIONS USE.—The term “communications use” means the placement and operation of communications facility.

(4) COMMUNICATIONS USE AUTHORIZATION.—The term “communications use authorization” means an easement, right-of-way, lease, license, or other authorization to locate or modify a communications facility on covered land by the Forest Service for the primary purpose of authorizing the occupancy and use of the covered land for communications use.

(5) COVERED LAND.—The term “covered land” means National Forest System land.

(6) FOREST SERVICE.—The term “Forest Service” means the United States Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

(7) ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT.—The term “organizational unit” means, within the Forest Service—

(A) a regional office;

(B) the headquarters;

(C) a management unit; or

(D) a ranger district office.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 6409 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1455) or section 606 of the Repack Airwaves Yielding Better Access for Users of Modern Services Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-141), not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations—

(1) to streamline the process for considering applications to locate or modify communications facilities on covered land;

(2) to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the process is uniform and standardized across the organizational units of the Forest Service; and

(3) to require that the applications described in paragraph (1) be considered and granted on a competitively neutral, technology neutral, and non-discriminatory basis.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations issued under subsection (b) shall include the following:

(1) Procedures for the tracking of applications described in subsection (b)(1), including—

(A) identifying the number of applications—

- (i) received;
- (ii) approved; and
- (iii) denied;

(B) in the case of an application that is denied, describing the reasons for the denial; and

(C) describing the amount of time between the receipt of an application and the issuance of a final decision on an application.

(2) Provision for minimum lease terms of not less than 15 years for leases with respect to the location of communications facilities on covered land.

(3) A policy under which a communications use authorization renews automatically on expiration, unless the communications use authorization is revoked for good cause.

(4) A structure of fees for—

(A) submitting an application described in subsection (b)(1), based on the cost to the Forest Service of considering such an application; and

(B) issuing communications use authorizations, based on the cost to the Forest Service of any maintenance or other activities required to be performed by the Forest Service as a result of the location or modification of the communications facility.

(5) Provision that if the Forest Service does not grant or deny an application under subparagraph (A) by the deadline established in section 6409 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act as amended by the Repack Airwaves Yielding Better Access for Users of Modern Services Act of 2018 (47 U.S.C. 1455(b)(3)(A)), the Forest Service shall be deemed to have granted the application.

(6) Provision for prioritization or streamlining the consideration of applications to locate or modify communications facilities on covered land in a previously disturbed right-of-way.

(d) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—In issuing regulations under subsection (b), the Secretary shall consider—

(1) how discrete reviews in considering an application described in subsection (b)(1) can be conducted simultaneously, rather than sequentially, by any organizational units of the Forest Service that must approve the location or modification; and

(2) how to eliminate overlapping requirements among the organizational units of the Forest Service with respect to the location or modification of a communications facility on covered land administered by those organizational units.

(e) COMMUNICATION OF STREAMLINED PROCESS TO ORGANIZATIONAL UNITS.—The Secretary shall, with respect to the regulations issued under subsection (b)—

(1) communicate the regulations to the organizational units of the Forest Service; and

(2) ensure that the organizational units of the Forest Service follow the regulations.

(f) DEPOSIT AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

(1) SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish a special account in the Treasury for the Forest Service for the deposit of fees collected by the Forest Service under subsection (c)(4) for communications use authorizations on covered land granted, issued, or executed by the Forest Service.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR FEES COLLECTED.—Fees collected by the Forest Service under subsection (c)(4) shall be—

(A) based on the costs described in subsection (c)(4); and

(B) competitively neutral, technology neutral, and nondiscriminatory with respect to other users of the communications site.

(3) DEPOSIT OF FEES.—Fees collected by the Forest Service under subsection (c)(4) shall be deposited in the special account established for the Forest Service under paragraph (1).

(4) AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Amounts deposited in the special account for the Forest Service shall be available, to the extent and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts, to the Secretary to cover costs incurred by the Forest Service described in subsection (c)(4), including the following:

(A) Preparing needs assessments or other programmatic analyses necessary to designate communications sites and issue communications use authorizations.

(B) Developing management plans for communications sites.

(C) Training for management of communications sites.

(D) Obtaining or improving access to communications sites.

(5) NO ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), no other amounts are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

(g) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—

(1) REAL PROPERTY AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall be construed as providing any executive agency with any new leasing or other real property authorities not existing prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, and no actions taken pursuant to this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall impact a decision or determination by any executive agency to sell, dispose of, declare excess or surplus, lease, reuse, or redevelop any Federal real property pursuant to title 40, United States Code, the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-387), or any other law governing real property activities of the Federal Government. No agreement entered into pursuant to this section, or the amendments made by this section, may obligate the Federal Government to hold, control, or otherwise retain or use real property that may otherwise be deemed as excess, surplus, or that could otherwise be sold, leased or redeveloped.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, the largest broadband deployment gap exists in rural communities, where more than 12 million Americans lack coverage.

Wireless communications companies require access to land or infrastructure to site the antennas necessary to provide service. Often, to reach more rural areas throughout our country, they require access to Federal land to ensure more complete coverage, including for providing emergency services. This need is expected to increase as providers deploy facilities to support 5G wireless services, which will require more antennas spaced closer together.

Unfortunately, the process for securing access to Federal land and property

has been problematic, with red-tape bureaucracy being the main issue. Providers have experienced lost or missing applications, paperwork left to languish for years, varying or undisclosed rules within agencies, redundant historical or environmental reviews, and inconsistent denials of the process.

In some cases, providers do not even receive a response from Federal agencies, resulting in stalled build-out and discouragement in rural areas. This is completely unacceptable.

My amendment today seeks to streamline and expedite the regulatory framework necessary to utilize Federal lands for broadband infrastructure deployments.

Specifically, the language would require the Secretary of Agriculture, within 1 year of enactment, to issue regulations that would streamline the siting process for Forest Service land and ensure that the process is uniform across all of the organizational units of the Forest Service, while eliminating overlapping requirements.

Applications would be trackable and deemed granted if not acted upon within 270 days, which is 9 months.

Lastly, any fees collected for allowing siting on Forest Service land can be used for processing the applications and the development, management, and improvement of sites for communications facilities.

I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment that simply aims to improve access to rural broadband coverage for rural Americans, who deserve it, across this Nation.

Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), my colleague and good friend.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my good friend and colleague Congressman LAMALFA's amendment.

The amendment aims to streamline a bureaucratic process that is hampering broadband infrastructure development in rural America.

As chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus and Representative for Arizona's Fourth Congressional District, I can tell you that this problem is all too real in the communities that I represent.

Many families and businesses in the West still lack basic broadband. According to a November 2017 Brookings Institution study, more than 50 percent of my district live in neighborhoods without an available broadband connection. Many of you all will find this hard to believe, but a huge chunk of my district has no social media platform whatsoever.

Closing the broadband availability gap should be a priority for all Members of Congress. Doing so will create jobs, improve education, and grow our economy.

I applaud Representative LAMALFA for his leadership and tireless efforts to close the broadband availability gap, and I urge adoption of this excellent amendment.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Arizona. I appreciate the support and his excellent words toward that.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, again, the concerns about this might be on environmental issues. This amendment does not allow anyone to circumvent environmental protections already in place. It simply requires an agency to fix the current regulatory maze, filled with excessive red tape, to deploy broadband infrastructure. That is it.

To be clear, if you wanted to deploy broadband networks across the country that support 5G, we should really be doing something about it now.

Americans rely on broadband for their jobs, telemedicine, distance learning, emergency services, and many more good reasons. Again, with almost half of rural Americans not having access to good broadband internet today, they will continue to lag behind and suffer if we do not address these regulatory barriers.

Mr. Chairman, 270 days, 9 months, really, that should be a long enough gestation period to process applications by these Federal agencies.

Mr. Chair, I ask for the “aye” vote, and I appreciate support on both sides of the aisle.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 85 ____ . REPORT ON WILDFIRE, INSECT INFESTATION, AND DISEASE PREVENTION ON FEDERAL LAND.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every year thereafter, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Interior shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a jointly written report on—

(1) the number of acres of Federal land treated by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior for wildfire, insect infestation, or disease prevention;

(2) the number of acres of Federal land categorized as a high or extreme fire risk;

(3) the total timber production from Federal land;

(4) the number of acres and average fire intensity of wildfires affecting Federal land treated for wildfire, insect infestation, or disease prevention;

(5) the number of acres and average fire intensity of wildfires affecting Federal land not treated for wildfire, insect infestation, or disease prevention; and

(6) the Federal response time for each fire on greater than 25,000 acres.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

My amendment is simple. It calls for the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to report back on the progress they are making to address the problem of catastrophic wildfires, a problem that has continued to get worse year after year under the current program.

Our current forest management process took decades of mismanagement, inaction, and neglect to create. We have essentially slowly and methodically loved our trees to death on much of our Federal lands. It will take decades to reverse the effects this mismanagement has had on our forests, during which time we will likely see more major, devastating wildfires.

This amendment simply requires our Federal agencies addressing this issue to report back on how they are doing, not only so Congress can provide oversight on their progress but so the American people can know how their Federal Government is doing so that we can measure, monitor, and demand accountability.

Mr. Chairman, I think I speak for this entire Chamber when I say that our goal is to reduce the effects of wildfires and be transparent for the American people each step of the way. My amendment promotes transparency and accountability as we work towards this goal.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 8506. COLLABORATIVE FOREST LANDSCAPE RESTORATION PROGRAM.

Section 4003 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by inserting “, except the Secretary may waive, on a case-by-case basis, the 10-year period requirement under paragraph (1)(B) of such subsection” after “subsection (b)”;

and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking “proposal” and all that follows through “in excess” and inserting “proposal in excess”; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking “2019” and inserting “2023”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

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

This amendment would reauthorize the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program, CFLRP, for another 5-year period. This program was initiated in 2009, and, basically, it aims to restore vital sections of our national forestlands.

There are two projects in New Mexico, the Zuni Mountains and the Southwest Jemez, with over 420,000 acres total, that would be covered under this collaborative project.

The Zuni Mountains project supports one of the last mills in New Mexico. We used to have 123 mills that processed timber. Now we are down to just one or two. That destruction in the capacity and the infrastructure for our national forest has been devastating to our ability to really accomplish projects of selective thinning and balanced management of our forests.

The extension of the program is going to provide enough certainty so that this last mill operator can make investments that will reduce the cost of conducting forest management activities in western New Mexico.

If we lose the mill, if it does, in fact, close—which should not be an option—it is going to increase the cost of the projects due to transportation costs. So it makes sense for the government, it makes sense for the U.S. Forest Service, the taxpayer, and the local economy to keep this mill open and to find others that would reopen with these collaborative projects that come under this program.

This program is a good starting point, and, when paired with other reforms that open up more acreage for treatment, it is going to increase the profitability of restoration projects. That will, in turn, save taxpayers money.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this non-controversial amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 538, after line 23, add the following new section:

SEC. 8506. WEST FORK FIRE STATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNTY.—The term “County” means Dolores County, Colorado.

(2) WEST FORK FIRE STATION CONVEYANCE PARCEL.—The term “West Fork Fire Station Conveyance Parcel” means the parcel of approximately 3.61 acres of National Forest System land in the County, as depicted on the map entitled “Map for West Fork Fire Station Conveyance Parcel” and dated November 21, 2017.

(b) CONVEYANCE OF WEST FORK FIRE STATION CONVEYANCE PARCEL, DOLORES COUNTY, COLORADO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of a request from the County and subject to such terms and conditions as are mutually satisfactory to the Secretary and the County, including such additional terms as the Secretary determines to be necessary, the Secretary shall convey to the County without consideration all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the West Fork Fire Station Conveyance Parcel.

(2) COSTS.—Any costs relating to the conveyance under paragraph (1), including processing and transaction costs, shall be paid by the County.

(3) USE OF LAND.—The land conveyed to the County under paragraph (1) shall be used by the County only for a fire station, related infrastructure, and roads to facilitate access to and through the West Fork Fire Station Conveyance Parcel.

(4) REVERSION.—If any portion of the land conveyed under paragraph (1) is used in a manner that is inconsistent with the use described in paragraph (3), the land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, West Fork is in a remote part of Dolores County, Colorado, surrounded by the San Juan National Forest. Emergency and fire response is a challenge in this part of the county because the closest fire station is currently 26 miles away.

The amendment I have offered would authorize the Forest Service to convey approximately 3.6 acres of National Forest System land to Dolores County for the strict purpose of building and operating a fire station in the West Fork area.

In addition to creating emergency and fire response challenges, the lack of a dedicated fire station has created insurance challenges for homeowners in West Fork. In an area surrounded by the national forestland, it is critical to have fire insurance for your home and other structures on your property. With no fire station in reasonable proximity to the area, it is nearly impossible for homeowners to obtain fire insurance in West Fork.

The text of this amendment is identical to the West Fork Fire Station Act, which passed the House by a voice vote last month. I encourage my colleagues to once again support this measure as an amendment to H.R. 2.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 601, after line 26, add the following new section:

SEC. 11105. REGIONAL CATTLE AND CARCASS GRADING CORRELATION AND TRAINING CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish not more than three regional centers, to be known as “Cattle and Carcass Grading Correlation and Training Centers” (referred to in this section as the “Centers”), to provide education and training for cattle and carcass beef graders of the Agricultural Marketing Service, cattle producers, and other professionals involved in the reporting, delivery, and grading of feeder cattle, live cattle, and carcasses—

(1) to limit the subjectivity in the application of beef grading standards;

(2) to provide producers with greater confidence in the price of the producers’ cattle; and

(3) to provide investors with both long and short positions more assurance in the cattle delivery system.

(b) LOCATION.—The Centers shall be located near cattle feeding and slaughter populations and areas shall be strategically identified in order to capture regional variances in cattle production.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—Each Center shall be organized and administered by offices of the Department of Agriculture in operation on the date on which the respective Center is established, or in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies or academic institutions.

(d) TRAINING PROGRAM.—The Centers shall offer intensive instructional programs involving classroom and field training work for individuals described in subsection (a).

(e) COORDINATION OF RESOURCES.—Each Center, in carrying out the functions of the Center, shall make use of information generated by the Department of Agriculture, the State agricultural extension and research stations, relevant designated contract markets, and the practical experience of area cattle producers, especially cattle producers cooperating in on-farm demonstrations, correlations, and research projects.

(f) PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION.—Funds made available to carry out this section shall not be used for the construction of a new building or facility or the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, or alteration of an existing building or facility (including site grading and improvement, and architect fees). Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the Secretary may use funds made available to carry out this section to provide a Center with payment for the cost of the rental of a space determined to be necessary by the Center for conducting training under this section and may accept donations (including in-kind contributions) to cover such cost.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on October 1, 2018.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to commend the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. CONAWAY, for his work not only in formulating this bill but in promoting and protecting the interests of rural America. I think it is a great tribute to him dealing with a number of complex issues, and I appreciate very much a job well done.

Mr. Chairman, when we go to the grocery store, we make decisions about what type of beef and what grade of beef we are going to purchase. The challenge is that the grades are different from place to place because there is not a uniform grading system across the country.

My amendment requires USDA to set up three training centers to train graders so that there can be more standardization. If you are going to buy a prime or a choice steak in one place, it should be roughly the same as a prime or choice steak in another place.

This will benefit consumers. It will benefit the beef industry, and I hope our colleagues will support it.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

**AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION
ACT OF 2018**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON). Pursuant to House Resolution 900 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1515

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEBER of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 20 printed in part C of House Report 115-677 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to House Resolution 900, no further amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute referred to in House Resolution 891 shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-679.

Each such further amendment shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-679.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 1301 and insert the following new sections:

SEC. 1301. SUGAR PROGRAM.

(a) LOAN RATES.—Section 156 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272) is amended by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following new subsections:

“(a) SUGARCANE.—The Secretary shall make loans available to processors of domestically grown sugarcane at a rate equal to—

“(1) 18.75 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2018 crop year; and

“(2) 18.00 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2019 through 2023 crop years.

“(b) SUGAR BEETS.—The Secretary shall make loans available to processors of domestically grown sugar beets at a rate equal to 128.5 percent of the loan rate per pound of raw cane sugar for the applicable crop year under subsection (a) for each of the 2018 through 2023 crop years.”.

(b) AVOIDING FORFEITURES WHILE ENSURING ADEQUATE SUPPLIES AT REASONABLE PRICES.—Section 156(f) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(f)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “WHILE ENSURING ADEQUATE SUPPLIES AT REASONABLE PRICES” after “FORFEITURES”; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting “ensure adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices and” after “shall”.

(c) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Section 156(i) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(i)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 1302. FEEDSTOCK FLEXIBILITY PROGRAM FOR BIOENERGY PRODUCERS TERMINATION.

Section 9010 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8110) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) TERMINATION.—The Secretary may not carry out the feedstock flexibility program under subsection (b) for the 2019 or subsequent crops of eligible commodities.”.

SEC. 1303. ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS.

Part VII of subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359aa et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“PART VII—SUGAR

“SEC. 359. ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, at the beginning of fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter through the end of the effective period, the Secretary shall establish the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar to provide adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices, but at no less than the minimum level necessary to comply with obligations under international trade agreements that have been approved by Congress.

“(b) ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall adjust tariff-rate quotas established under subsection (a) in such a manner as to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that stocks of raw cane and refined beet sugar are adequate throughout the crop year to meet the needs of the marketplace, including the efficient utilization of cane refining capacity.

“(c) TRANSFER OF QUOTA SHARES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations that—

“(A) promote full use of the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar and ensure adequate supplies for cane refiners in the United States;

“(B) provide that any country that has been allocated a share of the quotas may temporarily transfer all or part of the share to any other country that has also been allocated a share of the quotas.

“(2) TRANSFERS VOLUNTARY.—Any transfer under this subsection shall be valid only pursuant to a voluntary agreement between the transferor and the transferee, consistent with procedures established by the Secretary.

“(3) LIMITATIONS ON TRANSFERS WITH RESPECT TO FISCAL YEAR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any transfer under this subsection shall be valid only for the duration of the fiscal year during which the transfer is made.

“(B) FOLLOWING FISCAL YEAR.—No transfer under this subsection shall affect the share of the quota allocated to the transferor or transferee for the following fiscal year.

“(d) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—This section shall be effective for fiscal years only through the 2023 crop year for sugar.”.

Strike section 6410.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague MIKE CONAWAY and the other members of the Agriculture Committee for their work on the farm bill. I have every intention of voting for the bill and have stated that on many occasions.

Having been working on a reauthorization of a major bill recently, I can certainly sympathize with the effort here and say that, overall, this bill is an improvement on past farm bills because it responds to the desperate need of work requirements for able-bodied people.

However, there is another piece of this bill that has been around for a

long time, 85 years, that is not corrected, is decidedly bad policy, and is long overdue to be corrected, and our amendment does that.

This amendment is not new. In fact, this body has debated it in every farm bill for over a generation. The issue of which I speak is the issue with sugar and the need for reform of the way we treat sugar, which is different from all other commodity programs.

It is the only program that provides both loan supports and supply management. Supply management is the ugly cousin of direct payments. It rewards inactivity.

Americans are outraged when they hear tales of direct payments to farmers for not producing something. That same injustice—reward for inactivity, protection from competition—is what we find in the sugar program.

Let's be crystal-clear about what the sugar program does. It puts the government in charge of deciding how much sugar will be produced in this country, which inflates the cost, and it guarantees the processing industry a base profit by giving them subsidized loans. We stopped these practices years ago for other commodities, and only sugar is left with this sweet deal.

When the government gets into picking winners and losers, American jobs are at risk. The International Trade Commission has stated that for every job the sugar program protects we lose three manufacturing jobs. Congress should not be in the business of defending a program that is a bona fide job killer.

This amendment has a broad coalition of support. Free market groups, economists, environmentalists, consumer groups, and manufacturers all support this amendment.

Let me tell you about the other coalition. It is not very large. It is made up of 13 vertically integrated sugar processors. That is it. Our government is transferring wealth to these processors. It shifts cost onto our Nation's manufacturers and consumers by almost \$4 billion annually.

We are going to hear that the amendment subjects farmers to some new exposure to foreign imports. What they will fail to tell you is that, between our government's suspension agreements, import quotas, and tariffs, our government already regulates every single ounce of foreign sugar coming into our market. Will our amendment weaken the ability of the USDA to regulate these imports? Not in the slightest. We simply give USDA more flexibility.

We are going to hear arguments about candy bars, candy companies, and lots of other distractions. But it is all brought up to shift your attention away from the very program we are here to debate, the sugar program.

In reality, the sugar program hates sunshine. It hates getting the spotlight. But I am glad we are debating it here today.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in extreme opposition to Ms. FOXX's amendment.

She singles out sugar, cuts its program back to where it was 33 years ago, and denigrates the hardworking men and women who are farmers. Those processors she mentioned are co-op-owned; they are owned by those hardworking farmers. There is no inactivity with respect to the sugar industry. She couldn't be more wrong or more disrespectful of them.

Her amendment would not save the taxpayer one dime. Fifteen out of the last 16 years, the sugar program has worked. The reason we have not changed it over all those years is because it does work. If we were to move it under title I to treat it exactly the way the other commodities are treated, it would cost billions of taxpayer dollars. We don't want that, and the sugar industry is not asking for that.

This amendment will not save the consumer one penny. These large sugar users, of whom I am a great customer, buy by the carload. When the price of sugar dropped to half of what it should have been in 2013 as a result of Mexico cheating on the trade deal, they did not share that profit with anybody.

Quite frankly, just to put it succinctly, if sugar was such a driving cost in the cost of all production and the cost to all the jobs that the gentleman mentioned, my diet soda would cost dramatically less than a sugar soda. They don't. They cost exactly the same. They still give this product away in restaurants.

So, as we go about this issue, this is about protecting American jobs and American hardworking farmers from unfair, undue competition from around the world.

We don't let other products come into this country at below the cost of production. We do it when we fight steel. We had a recent fight against Turkey over the imports of steel because it was below the cost of production. We would protect all other products that way. We just simply leave this one in place because it works year-in and year-out, except for the 1 year Mexico cheated. They admitted they cheated on the program, and that is when it cost the American taxpayers money.

So it doesn't cost, it doesn't save taxpayer money, and it doesn't save consumers money. It is simply a windfall of some amount to the sugar buyers and users.

I don't have a grudge against them at all. Like I said, I eat and drink their products. I am trying to defend American farmers from products being produced overseas by slave labor in some instances, child labor in other instances, standards under which we don't produce. It is dumped into these

markets because those governments, unlike ours, have a direct payment to their farmers and producers to keep them in business.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I thank her for her leadership on this issue.

This amendment is long overdue. The sugar program that currently exists has distorted the marketplace for too long. According to one estimate, it has driven up consumer prices by over \$4 billion a year. And it is making it more difficult for us to negotiate greater market access in trade negotiations overseas.

Mr. Chairman, I am also disappointed that many of my fiscally responsible reform amendments were rejected late last night in the Rules Committee, such as:

Why do multimillionaires and billionaires still qualify for agriculture subsidies under the current bill?

Why do those earning over \$500,000 in adjusted gross income get subsidies under this bill?

Why are multiple people on the same farm receiving the same subsidies under this bill, from husbands to wives, to sons, to daughters, the nephews, the nieces, the cousins?

Why can't we at least track where the crop insurance premium subsidies are going, which is currently prohibited under this bill?

This legislation should be working for family farmers, not powerful special interests here in Washington. I fear it is a missed opportunity.

This amendment at least introduces some modicum of reform, which is long overdue, in a program that has distorted the marketplace for too long.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to accept this amendment today.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), who is the ranking member of the powerful Agriculture Committee.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish my friends on the Ways and Means Committee would actually do something about the illegal subsidization that is going on in the sugar industry in the world instead of coming here and complaining about a program that actually works.

I have the biggest sugar district in the country. The people who grow sugar in my district are small farmers. They use their own money to build the plant. It is probably 25 percent of the economy in the north part of my district.

All this amendment would do is give these jobs and this market away to other countries that are subsidizing their people more than we are in the

United States. And they are working these plants with child labor, slave labor, in these other places.

Is that what you want to do? Give away our jobs to places where there are no environmental regulations?

You go down to Brazil. They are making sugar out of sugarcane. They are burning it with gas. It goes right into the atmosphere. There is no EPA. There are no regulations whatsoever. They are putting this vinasse, which is like oil, right into the river.

And we are going to get rid of an industry in the United States that is doing a good job? It is the lowest cost producer in the world, and we are going to give it up because other people are cheating?

Now, people say that this thing costs money. It only cost money 1 year, and the reason is because the Mexicans dumped in our market and our government didn't do anything about it. When we finally got the suspension agreement in place, then we were able to get this thing stabilized.

So this is an amendment that is not needed. This is a program that works. The reason we have this program is to protect ourselves from all these other countries that are subsidizing their industries more than we are in the United States.

We are the lowest cost producer in my district. We are the lowest cost producer of anyplace in the world. We can compete, but we can't compete against governments that are dumping money in and not following environmental regulations and not following child labor laws. We can't compete against that.

So please vote down this amendment. It is something that is not necessary and is not needed.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, not my words, but the International Trade Commission says that for every job sugar protects, we lose three manufacturing jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

I come here to the House floor as the son, grandson, and great-grandson of farmers. I grew up working on a farm in rural Texas, and I strongly oppose Federal subsidies to agriculture in general and the sugar program in particular.

Under the Federal sugar program, which dates back to the New Deal, domestic sugar prices are propped up via a Byzantine system of marketing, allotments, import quotas, price supports, and a loan guarantee program so bad it would make a Soviet commissar blush.

This may be a sweet deal for sugar producers, but it is not a sweet deal for the auto mechanic in Mesquite, Texas; the store clerk in Mineola, Texas; or the teacher in Garland, Texas, that I represent in the Fifth District. Where is their government subsidy program?

This is antijob. It is a food tax. It is income redistribution at its worst. And it is not commensurate with any free market principle I know.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support the amendment.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I point out that over half of all U.S. sugar processing operations in the United States since 1980 have closed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH0).

Mr. YOH0. Mr. Chairman, this is a farm policy. The farm policy is there to produce a policy so that the American farmers can go out and raise crops for the United States of America to continue to produce the highest quality, the most abundant, and the cheapest food produced in the world of any industrialized nation. That is why we have a farm policy.

This amendment of Ms. FOXX goes after the American farmers for the betterment of multinational soda companies and candy companies, and the price of sugar won't go down. In my hometown, a 4-pound bag of sugar costs \$2.64.

I would ask every Member of Congress: How many constituents in your district have come up to you and pleaded for you to do something about the cost of sugar?

□ 1530

This is about the American farmer, not about candy companies and soda companies. It is misdirected. I oppose it and strongly advise everybody to vote against it.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would also point out the additional closed plants and jobs lost in the sugar growing industry.

U.S.- and foreign-sweetened product manufacturers have announced 100 plant openings, acquisitions, or expansions within the United States over that same timeframe.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support fair sugar policy.

The sugar program represents a hidden tax on American businesses and consumers and is responsible for the loss of U.S. food manufacturing jobs.

Each month, families go to the grocery store, and unbeknownst to them, the sugar in many of the products they buy is subject to a cost that is generally 30 to 40 percent higher than the world cost. Very few, if any, will ever know that a hidden sugar tax has been imposed upon them by the sugar program. This hidden tax totals at least \$2.4 billion a year for American consumers.

There are more than 600,000 sugar-using industry jobs in our Nation, including thousands in Virginia's Sixth District. I want to stand up and be counted as an advocate for keeping those jobs in the United States.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for this amendment to help put an end to the hidden costs of the sugar program.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time is left on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that that hidden tax that my colleagues are talking about will not be shared with the consumers. It has never been shared with the price of sugar. It goes down. It will simply shift those profits into multinational corporations that we are defending by supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, as you may guess, I am a big fan of a good candy bar.

In 1983, a candy bar cost 35 cents and had a cost of about 2 cents worth of sugar. Thirty-five years later, I am still a fan of candy bars. In 2018, that same candy bar costs \$1.49—they are a little slimmer—and the cost of sugar is still 2 cents.

United States retail sugar costs are the lowest in the world: 59 cents a pound compared to 71 cents on the open market. The sugar program cost the taxpayers zero in the last 16 years.

Rather than message about alleged conservative amendments, let's focus on addressing meaningful changes. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that there are lots of companies that use sugar and are behemoths. I represent a number of them in Portland, Oregon, that are confectioners, candy makers, and bakers who are concerned about this.

In terms of the benefit, think about the 13 mega processors that the sugar program forces manufacturers to pay far more than they need. This is a \$3 billion burden on the taxpayer.

We have an opportunity here to deal with one other area. If we start getting the pricing right, there is another hidden tax in terms of the sugar system that we have, and that has been on the Florida Everglades.

We have a \$7.5 billion down payment because of the damage that has been inflicted on the Everglades by the massive cane sugar operation that has increased dramatically in the last 50 years, a cost that taxpayers will be footing and environmental costs to go with the burden on sugar-using industries.

I strongly urge approval of the amendment.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the Republican chair-

man of the committee and the Democratic ranking member of this committee both oppose this amendment, for good reason.

It is a simple question: Do we want to support local growers like the 900 families that I represent who, collectively, through a co-op, own their processing facility?

This notion of mega producers is really a story of 900 families that collectively bound together in a co-op to own the production facility to deal with the sugar that they, themselves, grow.

This is a question of local growers or foreign-subsidized sugar using child labor. That is the simple question before us.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which will create some fairness for more than 600,000 workers across our country who are in small businesses and manufacturing facilities that use sugar as an ingredient in the products they make. Over 91,000 of those jobs and 2,300 of those businesses are in my home State of California.

This amendment would make the sugar program fairer for taxpayers, manufacturers, and American consumers. By removing the many unnecessary government interventions that have kept sugar prices excessively high, manufacturers will create jobs and American consumers will no longer be on the hook for \$4 billion per year in hidden sugar costs.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the U.S. is the third largest importer of sugar in the world, and virtually all of that comes in duty free.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, not long ago, President Trump successfully negotiated an agreement with Mexico to stop them from dumping illegally subsidized sugar onto the U.S. market. This amendment would undo the President's good work by reopening the floodgates to other foreign countries to send us their subsidized sugar at below their costs of production, further depressing the prices that my farmers receive.

Vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, when other militaries challenge the United States' military might, we invest more dollars, just like we did a few months ago in our military.

When the Panama Canal was widened and deepened, we invested more dollars in our ports so we would remain competitive. When other countries have lowered tax rates, we lower ours to

make sure that we remain competitive and we can defend our folks.

Mr. Chairman, I represent thousands of farmers from Louisiana who depend upon this crop. If we pass this amendment, the precedent that it sets rolling into other types of crops will devastate American farmers.

This amendment is a flawed amendment. It is going to undermine our agriculture industry across the United States. I urge opposition.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not only about being against a Soviet-style regime and the quotas and a variety of other things that come with it, but this amendment is, hopefully, about common sense.

The one thing we don't want to subsidize are the things that cause us problems. We are now spending more than a quarter of a trillion dollars in healthcare costs as type 2 diabetes has ballooned. To give you the exact number, \$327 billion a year is spent on type 2 diabetes.

So the idea of saying let's subsidize our sugar so that we can then spend more on healthcare is something that needs to be looked at.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It is interesting to listen to the various arguments here, but certainly there is unfair competition, if you will—it is hard to even call it competition—overseas, but we have unfair trade practices. Sugar policy here helps us defend ourselves.

These are manufacturing jobs in western Nebraska that utilize, very responsibly, our natural resources, and I think it is only reasonable to continue a policy that is not generally a cost to taxpayers.

I urge opposition to this amendment. Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, the current U.S. sugar program represents an anti-free market scheme that imposes a massive hidden tax on both American businesses and consumers for the benefit of a small, concentrated group of special interests.

People say, well, we have got the safest, cheapest food source in the world in the United States. It is cheap because we are paying for it with our taxes. These are Soviet-style policies imposing significant, unnecessary costs on the domestic food manufacturing industry and the consumer.

Policies have imposed \$2.4 billion to \$4 billion worth of losses to sugar users across the Nation. These industries provide jobs to 600,000 Americans, including 40,000 Pennsylvanians.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in solidarity with south Texas sugar and in opposition to the Foxx-Davis amendment.

In deep south Texas, we are proud of our sugar corporation, our sugar mill, and the jobs they support. Our existing sugar policy levels the playing field for American producers in the ever volatile world of the sugar market. It works. Sugar growers in my district can attest to that. Better yet, it has come at no cost to taxpayers for 14 of the last 15 years.

I ask everyone to vote "no" on this amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, do I have the right to close or does the gentleman from Texas have the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has the right to close.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Foxx amendment.

In my home State of Minnesota, sugar beet is number one. That means this amendment will directly hurt my State's economy.

Minnesota's sugar creates more than 28,000 jobs and has an annual impact of more than \$3 billion. This amendment will cost Minnesota and other sugar-producing States so much more. It will hurt farmers, small businesses, schools, hospitals—real lives of real people in rural communities that this bill is supposed to help.

We should be supporting American farmers instead of sending their jobs to countries that heavily subsidize sugar production, like Brazil and Mexico. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this harmful amendment, and I ask them to stand with farmers in Minnesota and all across the United States.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, in closing, our government's current sugar program is a job killer. It ensures profits for the connected few at the expense of the many. It operates at a substantial cost to taxpayers, consumers, and businesses. It is rooted in supply management economics that were drafted nearly 90 years ago.

Every other commodity program was subjected to reforms during the last farm bill except the sugar program. Economists, consumer groups, environmentalists, manufacturers, editorial boards, and groups on both the left and right of the ideological spectrum have all endorsed the idea of substantially reforming this program.

It is time to end Congress' codification of a special interest giveaway. It

is time to modernize the sugar program. I ask my colleagues to support our amendment and the farm bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I couldn't disagree more.

The savings that are touted by the folks who are in favor of this amendment will not be shared with consumers. They will be kept by these multinational corporations and, yes, the small sugar users across this country. So prices will not go down.

There are no tax dollars involved, despite the rhetoric to the contrary, except for 1 year out of 16, because this program worked. This program was not changed in 2014 because it works. It doesn't cost the taxpayers money, sugar prices are not distorted, and the manufacturers will not be able to support the one instance where they have lowered the cost of their product when sugar prices did in fact drop as a result of the unfair, unlevel playing field, unlevel competition around this world.

If we could talk the rest of the world into going to a free market, to a level playing field, then I would agree completely with my colleagues who support this amendment.

□ 1545

We are not there. We are not even headed there. We need to defeat this amendment, protect those hardworking farmers out there across this country. Say "no" to Foxx.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-679.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 28, line 3, insert a comma after "2008".

Page 28, line 6, strike "covered commodity" and all that follows through "basis" on line 7, and insert the following: "covered-commodity-by-covered-commodity basis".

Page 103, strike lines 4 through 8.

Page 110, line 17, insert ", or eligible for indemnity or compensation payments through programs administered by the Secretary" before the period at the end.

Page 111, line 1, insert ", the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service," after "Conservation Service".

Page 218, line 15, strike "bachelors" and insert "bachelor's".

Page 224, line 22, strike “; and” and insert “a semicolon”.

Page 225, line 13, strike “, and” and insert “; and”.

Page 225, line 15, strike “member.” and insert “member; and”.

Page 228, line 18, strike “enactment of” and insert “enactment of the”.

Page 232, line 5, add “and” at the end.

Page 233, line 4, strike “and” and insert “or”.

Page 237, line 24, strike “Section 5” and insert “Effective October 1, 2020, section 5”.

Page 238, strike line 5, and insert the following:

(B) by striking “, supplemental security”

Page 241, line 18, insert “or disabled” after “elderly”.

Page 241, line 23, insert “or disabled” after “elderly”.

Page 242, line 5, insert “or disabled” after “elderly”.

Page 242, line 8, insert “or disabled” after “elderly”.

Page 246, line 11, insert “(including volunteer work that is limited to 6 months out of a 12-month period)” after “work”.

Page 248, strike line 10.

Page 248, line 17, strike the period and the close quotation marks.

Page 248, after line 17, insert the following:

“(iv) a program of employment and training for veterans operated by the Department of Labor or the Department of Veterans Affairs, and approved by the Secretary.”, and

Page 248, line 25, strike “paragraph” and insert “paragraphs (4) and”.

Page 249, line 2, strike “(D), and (C)” and insert “(C), and (D)”.

Page 251, line 2, insert “and with the approval of the chief executive officer of the State,” after “agency”.

Page 251, line 22, strike “6” and insert “7”.

Page 251, line 24, insert “most recent 24-month period for which Department of Labor unemployment rates are available, nor earlier than the” after “the”.

Page 253, line 14, strike “15-PERCENT” and insert “PERCENTAGE”.

Page 254, line 11, strike “; and” at the end, and insert a period.

Page 254, strike lines 12 and 13.

Page 254, strike lines 19 through 22, and insert the following:

“(iii) FISCAL YEARS 2021 THROUGH 2025.—Subject to clauses (v) and (vi), for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025, a State agency may provide a number”

Page 255, after line 7, insert the following:

“(iv) FISCAL YEAR 2026 AND THEREAFTER.—Subject to clauses (v) and (vi), for fiscal year 2026 and each fiscal year thereafter, a State agency may provide a number of exemptions such that the average monthly number of the exemptions in effect during the fiscal year does not exceed 12 percent of the number of covered individuals in the State in fiscal year 2019, as estimated by the Secretary, based on the survey conducted to carry out section 16(c) for the most recent fiscal year and such other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate due to the timing and limitations of the survey.”

Page 255, line 8, strike “(iv)” and insert “(v)”.

Page 255, line 17, strike “(v)” and insert “(vi)”.

Page 258, line 19, strike clause (iv) and redesignate succeeding clauses accordingly.

Page 258, beginning on line 22, strike “unpaid or volunteer work that is limited to 6 months out of a 12-month period” and insert “other work experience”.

Page 259, line 3, add “and” at the end.

Page 259, line 5, strike “and” at the end.

Page 259, strike lines 6 through 8.

Page 259, strike lines 9 and 10, and insert the following:

(C) in subparagraph (F)—

(i) clause (ii) by striking “one hundred and twenty hours per month” and inserting “the hours required under section 6(d)(1)(B)”, and

(ii) by striking clause (iii),

(D) by striking subparagraphs (D) and (E), and inserting the following:

Page 259, line 16, strike “(D)” and insert “(E)”.

Page 259, strike lines 18 and 19, and insert the following:

(F) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) through (M) as subparagraphs (E) through (L),

Beginning on page 259, strike line 22 and all that follows through line 2 on page 260, and insert the following:

(1) AMENDMENTS TO THE FOOD AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2008.—The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 5(d)(14) by striking “6(d)(4)(I)” and inserting “6(d)(4)(G)”, and

(B) in section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(dd) by striking “(4)(F)(i), or (4)(K)” and inserting “(4)(A)(ii), (4)(E)(i), or (4)(J)”.

Page 260, strike lines 24 and 25, and insert the following:

(1) by amending subsection (e)(5) to read as follows:

“(5) is—

“(A) a parent or other household member with responsibility for the care of a dependent child under age 6 or of an incapacitated person; or

“(B) a parent or other household member with responsibility for the care of a dependent child above the age of 5 and under the age of 12 for whom adequate child care is not available to enable the individual to attend class and satisfy the requirements of paragraph (4); and”.

Page 262, after line 24, insert the following:

(C) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

“(C) RETURN OF UNUSED EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING FUNDS TO THE TREASURY.—If a State agency will not expend all of the funds allocated to the State agency for a fiscal year under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall deposit such unused funds in the general receipts of the Treasury.”

Page 263, line 1, strike “(C)” and insert “(D)”.

Page 263, line 3, strike “(D)” and insert “(E)”.

Page 263, beginning on line 22, strike subsection (g).

Page 264, line 10, strike “(h)” and insert “(g).”

Page 264, strike lines 11 and 12, and insert the following:

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Section 20(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 3029(b) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “6(d)(1)” and inserting “6(d)(1)(B)”, and

(ii) by striking “or (F)” and inserting “(F), or (G)”, and

(B) in paragraph (4) by striking “sixteen” and inserting “18”.

Page 266, strike lines 1 through 6, and insert the following:

(B) in section 17(b) by striking paragraph (2).

Page 266, after line 6, insert the following:

(h) EQUITABLE TREATMENT OF HOUSEHOLDS.—Section 11(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)), as amended by section 4001, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(27) that the State agency may, for purposes of ensuring equitable treatment among all households (including those containing a married couple), request earned income data from the Internal Revenue Service relevant to determining eligibility to receive supple-

mental nutrition assistance program benefits and determining the correct amount of such benefits at the time of household certification.”.

Page 269, line 5, strike the comma at the end and insert a semicolon.

Page 269, strike lines 6 and 7.

Page 269, line 25, strike “and” at the end.

Page 269, after line 25, insert the following:

“(VII) requires that the State demonstration projects are voluntary for all retail food stores and that all recipients are able to use benefits in non-participating retail food stores; and”.

Page 270, line 1, strike “(VII)” and insert “(VIII)”.

Page 271, line 1, strike “PROCESSING” and insert “PROHIBITED”.

Page 271, line 10, insert “(as defined in subsection (j)(1)(H))” after “switching”.

Page 273, line 16, strike “independent” and all that follows through “means” on line 17, and insert the following: “independent sales organization” means”.

Page 291, line 5, strike “B Russell” and insert “B. Russell”.

Page 296, after line 13, insert the following:

(C) in paragraph (3)(B) by inserting “, other than those incurred by State agencies in preparing State plans pursuant to subsection (c)(2) and notifying applicants, participants, and eligible individuals pursuant to subsection (c)(4),” after “this section”,

Page 296, line 14, strike “(C)” and insert “(D)”.

Page 296, line 16, strike “(D)” and insert “(E)”.

Page 297, line 6, strike the close quotation marks and the comma at the end.

Page 297, strike line 7 and insert the following:

“(D) FUNDS AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated under this paragraph shall remain available for obligation for a period of 2 fiscal years.”, and

Page 299, strike lines 19 through 23, and insert the following:

(7) in section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(aa) by striking “3(n)” and inserting “3(m)”.

Page 300, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. 4037. REVIEW OF SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM OPERATIONS.

Section 9 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018), as amended by section 4026, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) REVIEW OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS.—

“(1) The Secretary—

“(A) shall review a representative sample of currently authorized retail food stores as defined in subsections (o)(2) and (k)(3) of section 3 to determine whether benefits are properly used by or on behalf of participating households residing in such facilities and whether such facilities are using more than one source of Federal or State funding to meet the food needs of residents;

“(B) may carry out similar reviews for currently participating residential drug and alcohol treatment and rehabilitation programs, and group living arrangements for the blind and disabled;

“(C) shall gather information and these entities shall be required to submit information deemed necessary for a full and thorough review; and

“(D) shall report the results of these reviews to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry of the Senate not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2018, along with recommendations as to any additional requirements or oversight that would be appropriate for such facilities and retailers, and whether these entities should continue to be

authorized to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

“(2) Nothing in this section shall authorize the Secretary to deny any application for continued authorization, any application for authorization, or any request to withdraw the authorization of any facility or entity referenced in subsections (o)(2) and (k)(3) of section 3 based on a determination that residents of any such facility or entity are residents of an institution prior to—

“(A) the submission of the report described in paragraph (1)(D); or

“(B) 3 years after the date of enactment of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2018; whichever is earlier.”.

Page 301, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 4103. ELIGIBILITY FOR COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM.

Section 5(g) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note) is amended—

(1) by striking “Except” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF CERTIFICATION PERIOD.—In this paragraph, the term ‘certification period’ means the period that a participant in the commodity supplemental food program may continue to receive benefits under that program without a formal review of the eligibility of the participant.

“(B) MINIMUM CERTIFICATION PERIOD.—Subject to subparagraph (C), a State shall establish a certification period of not less than 1 year.

“(C) EXTENSIONS.—On the request of a State, the Secretary shall approve a State certification period of more than 1 year on the condition that, on an annual basis, the local agency in the State administering the commodity supplemental food program—

“(i) verifies the address and continued interest of each participant in receiving program benefits; and

“(ii) has sufficient reason to determine that the participant still meets the income eligibility standards, which may include a determination that the participant has a fixed income.”.

Page 301, line 3, redesignate section 4103 as section 4104.

At the end of subtitle C of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4205. REVIEW AND REVISION OF CERTAIN NUTRITION REGULATIONS.

(a) REVIEW OF EXISTING REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and for the purposes described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall review—

(1) the final regulations on “National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program: Nutrition Standards for All Foods Sold in School as Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010” published by the Department of Agriculture in the Federal Register on July 29, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 50123 et seq.); and

(2) the final regulations on “Nutrition Standards in the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs” published by the Department of Agriculture in the Federal Register on January 26, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 4088 et seq.).

(b) FINALIZING NEW REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with school nutrition personnel and school leaders (including school administrators, school boards, and parents), shall finalize new regulations that revise the regulations described in subsection (a) based on the review of such regulations under such subsection, including any requirements for

milk, to ensure that the requirements of such regulations—

(1) are based on research based on school-age children;

(2) do not add costs in addition to the reimbursements required to carry out the school lunch program authorized under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) or the school breakfast program established by section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773); and

(3) maintain healthy meals for students.

Page 327, line 4, strike “health” and insert “health”.

Page 327, line 11, add a period at the end.

Page 343, line 12, strike “road mile” and insert “road-mile”.

Page 344, line 4, strike “and” at the end.

Page 361, after line 13, insert the following (and redesignate any succeeding section accordingly):

SEC. 6116. FEDERAL BROADBAND PROGRAM COORDINATION.

(a) CONSULTATION BETWEEN USDA AND NTIA.—The Secretary shall consult with the Assistant Secretary to assist in the verification of eligibility of the broadband loan and grant programs of the Department of Agriculture. In providing assistance under the preceding sentence, the Assistant Secretary shall make available the broadband assessment and mapping capabilities of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

(b) CONSULTATION BETWEEN USDA AND FCC.—

(1) BY USDA.—The Secretary shall consult with the Commission before making a broadband loan or grant for a project to serve an area with respect to which another entity is receiving Connect America Fund or Mobility Fund support under the Federal universal service support mechanisms established under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254).

(2) BY FCC.—The Commission shall consult with the Secretary before offering or providing Connect America Fund or Mobility Fund support under the Federal universal service support mechanisms established under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254) to serve an area with respect to which another entity has received an award under a broadband loan or grant program of the Department of Agriculture.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, the Commission, and the Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on how best to coordinate federally supported broadband programs and activities in order to achieve the following objectives:

(1) Promote high-quality broadband service that meets the long-term needs of rural residents and businesses, by evaluating the broadband service needs in rural areas for each decade through 2050.

(2) Support the long-term viability, sustainability, and utility of federally supported rural broadband infrastructure, by analyzing the technical capabilities of the technologies currently available and reasonably expected to be available by 2035 to meet the broadband service needs of rural residents identified under paragraph (1), including by analyzing the following:

(A) The real-world performance of such technologies, including data rates, latency, data usage restrictions, and other aspects of service quality, as defined by the Commission.

(B) The suitability of each such technology for residential, agricultural, educational,

healthcare, commercial, and industrial purposes in rural areas.

(C) The cost to deploy and support such technologies in several rural geographies.

(D) The costs associated with online platforms, specifically the resulting constraints on rural network bandwidth.

(3) Identify and quantify the availability of broadband service and ongoing broadband deployment in rural areas, including ways to do the following:

(A) Harmonize broadband notification and reporting requirements and develop common verification procedures across all federally supported broadband programs.

(B) Consolidate and utilize the existing broadband service data.

(C) Collect and share data on those projects in rural areas where Federal programs are currently supporting broadband deployment, including areas with respect to which an entity is receiving—

(i) support under a broadband loan or grant program of the Department of Agriculture; or

(ii) Connect America Fund or Mobility Fund support under the Federal universal service support mechanisms established under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254).

(D) Leverage support technologies and services from online platforms for providers of broadband service in rural areas.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term “Assistant Secretary” means the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

(3) RURAL AREA.—The term “rural area” has the meaning given the term in section 601(b)(3) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

Page 364, line 14, strike “tribes” and insert “Tribes”.

Page 374, line 1, strike “(U.S.C.)” and insert “U.S.C.”.

Page 379, line 24, strike “by striking” and all that follows through “and inserting” on line 25, and insert the following: “by striking ‘maintained under section 313(b)(2)(A)’ and inserting”.

Page 390, line 16, strike “and inserting” and all that follows through “; and” on line 17, and insert the following: “and inserting ‘305 or’; and”.

Page 394, line 8, strike “tribes” and insert “Tribes”.

Page 414, line 2, strike the extra space before the closed quotation mark.

Page 436, after line 11, insert the following: (b) PRIORITIES.—Section 412(h)(1) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7632(h)(1)) is amended by striking “multi-institutional” and inserting “or multi-institutional”.

Page 436, line 12, strike “(b)” and insert “(c)”.

Page 436, line 20, strike “(c)” and insert “(d)”.

Page 455, line 20, insert “or ranchers” after “farmers”.

Page 541, line 1, insert “address” before “other”.

Page 546, line 5, strike “in” and insert “on”.

Page 554, line 18, strike “The Administrator;” and insert “The Administrator”.

Page 575, line 2, strike “Department of Agriculture” and insert “Food and Drug Administration”.

Page 598, line 3, strike “and subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1)” and all that follows through “Secretary” on line 6, and insert the following: “of paragraph (1)”.

Page 598, line 9, insert “, not more than 4 percent may be retained by the Secretary to

pay administrative costs incurred by the Secretary" after "10409B".

Page 598, line 10, insert "of such paragraph" after "(B)".

Page 598, line 12, strike "and (B)" and all that follows through "paragraph" on line 13.

Page 598, line 13, strike "ten" and insert "10".

Page 599, line 3, insert before the period at the end the following: "to be made available for expenditure without further appropriation".

Page 621, line 23, strike "boys" and insert "boys".

Page 622, line 8, strike "boys" and insert "boys".

Page 635, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 11608. ESTABLISHMENT OF FOOD ACCESS LIAISON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), as amended by sections 11204 and 11607, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 223. FOOD ACCESS LIAISON.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish the position of Food Access Liaison to coordinate Department programs to reduce barriers to food access and monitor and evaluate the progress of such programs in accordance with this section.

"(b) DUTIES.—The Food Access Liaison shall—

"(1) coordinate the efforts of the Department, including regional offices, to experiment and consider programs and policies aimed at reducing barriers to food access for consumers, including but not limited to participants in nutrition assistance programs;

"(2) provide outreach to entities engaged in activities to reduce barriers to food access in accordance with the statutory authorization for each program;

"(3) provide outreach to entities engaged in activities to reduce barriers to food access, including retailers, markets, producers, and others involved in food production and distribution, with respect to the availability of, and eligibility for, Department programs;

"(4) raise awareness of food access issues in interactions with employees of the Department;

"(5) make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to efforts to reduce barriers to food access; and

"(6) submit to Congress an annual report with respect to the efforts of the Department to reduce barriers to food access."

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance to entities that are participants, or seek to participate, in Department of Agriculture programs related to reduction of barriers to food access.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2 includes a substantive, enforceable supportive work requirement for work-capable individuals 18 to 59. Waivers and exemptions were tightened to assure little abuse in a system currently rife with loopholes and gimmicks.

We have also heard from our conservative stakeholders that workfare is an important tool for EP participants. Based on their feedback and explicit examples of where this has been implemented correctly, this amendment includes establishment of that.

It is simply good policy to send unexpended funds back to the Treasury. This amendment does that.

Our colleagues on the other side said we did not count veteran-specific workforce development programs as a part of H.R. 2. Well, in addition to the provisions of H.R. 2 that has permitted State-based veteran workforce programs to count toward the work requirement, this amendment expands to include programs for veterans run by the Department of Labor and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, that would have been a terrific amendment for my colleagues to have offered in committee or on this floor, and we would have accepted it. They chose to stay on the sidelines.

I have a great food bank in my district, West Texas Food Bank. Its chief executive related how important it was to provide a 1-year certification period for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program for seniors, a program currently serving seniors. This makes sense and allows seniors easier access to this important program.

It is engagements like this that is what our process is all about, and we have amended our bill through this manager's amendment to include those.

Mr. Chair, we also have changes in here that strengthen our framework for coordinating between USDA on FCA, on important operations, broadband work that is going on across jurisdictions. We want those two agencies to work together to better utilize the funding to make sure that rural America gets that broadband support that we really need. That is included in here as well.

It also allows that communities will have a better opportunity to work for themselves rather than fighting the current bureaucracy here in Washington, D.C.

This amendment also includes a variety of technical amendments, corrections to the bill, that you would normally have in a manager's amendment, and I ask my colleagues to support the manager's amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I just want to say for the record that both Feeding America and Feeding Texas oppose this farm bill because they believe it will increase hunger in America, and I include the letter from Feeding Texas in the RECORD.

FEEDING TEXAS,
April 17, 2018.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONAWAY AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Regretfully and despite years of hard work, we are writing to oppose the farm bill proposed by Chairman Conaway, as we believe it will increase hunger and make it harder for struggling Texans to succeed.

Most SNAP recipients are children, seniors and people with disabilities. Among SNAP recipients who can work, most already do—just not at wages that allow them to escape poverty. To help these workers we need to address the weaknesses in our economy and our labor market that make it hard for them to get ahead.

Instead, this farm bill largely ignores the complex challenges faced by low-wage workers, imposing harsh new sanctions and requirements that will take food away from families who are willing but unable to find consistent work.

Hunger never helped anyone find a job.

According to the CBO, the Chairman's bill will move billions of dollars off the kitchen table, largely to finance state bureaucracies intended to assist recipients with employment. Food will remain critical fuel for the success of these families, yet this bill would effectively starve Peter to employ Paul.

Losing SNAP will make it harder for these families to make ends meet. We fully expect our food banks to experience the brunt of this increased need. Across Texas, our food banks already struggle to meet the demand in their communities, and we will not be able to keep up.

We are also very concerned that this bill will repeal state flexibility and put massive new responsibilities on states in pursuit of better employment outcomes for recipients. These ideas ignore the evidence-based policy making that the Chairman has espoused by selling a promise on work, but not delivering on the necessary funding or details.

We urge every member of the committee to reject this proposal, and return to a bipartisan process that will help more hard-working Americans avoid hunger and achieve financial security.

Sincerely,

Celia Cole, CEO, Feeding Texas; Zack Wilson, Executive Director, High Plains Food Bank; Theresa Mangapora, Executive Director, Brazos Valley Food Bank; Bea Hanson, Executive Director, Coastal Bend Food Bank; Dennis Cullinane, CEO, East Texas Food Bank; Robin Cadle, President/CEO, Food Bank of the Golden Crescent; Jody Houston, CEO, Food Bank of West Central Texas; Brian Greene, President/CEO Houston Food Bank.

Trisha Cunningham, President/CEO, North Texas Food Bank; Dan Maher, Executive Director, Southeast Texas Food Bank; Alma Boubel, Executive Director, South Texas Food Bank; Libby Campbell, Executive Director, West Texas Food Bank; Derrick Chubbs, President/CEO, Central Texas Food Bank; Gregory Duke, Executive Director, Concho Valley Regional Food Bank.

Susan Goodell, CEO, El Pasoans Fighting Hunger Food Bank; DeAnne Economides, Interim CEO, Food Bank of the Rio Grande Valley; Richard Nye, Executive Director, Galveston County Food Bank; Allison Hulett, President/CEO, Montgomery County Food Bank; Eric Cooper, President/CEO, San Antonio Food Bank; David Weaver, CEO, South Plains Food Bank; Bo Soderbergh, Executive Director, Tarrant Area Food Bank; Kara Nickens, Executive Director, Wichita Falls Area Food Bank.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I thought that this bill couldn't get any worse, but I was wrong. This amendment is a sure sign that this underlying farm bill is a complete mess. This manager's amendment is longer than most bills that we consider in this House.

First, it puts a Band-Aid on the beating the majority took during the markup when they finally realized that disabled people would be hurt by their zeal to sever LIHEAP from SNAP. But to do that, to help disabled people, cost them money, so they had to find savings somewhere. And they landed on taking away more flexibility from States for waivers, the result of which is that 600,000 people—600,000 more able-bodied adults without dependents—will lose SNAP.

Here is the best part of it: The 600,000 will be kicked off right away, at least a year before the mandatory work scheme—which is underfunded and will be a mass of bureaucracy—is in effect. So in spite of the rhetoric to provide on-ramps, off-ramps, trampolines, or whatever to help people get good jobs, they do not deliver—not for SNAP, and not for farmers.

As I have said over and over and over again, a farm bill should be a bipartisan product. It should be reflective of bipartisan concerns. It should help farmers, and it should help those struggling in need to put food on the table. This bill doesn't do enough to help farmers, and it certainly doesn't do anything to help people struggling with hunger. In fact, this bill makes hunger worse in America, and that is shameful.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 2 and the accompanying manager's amendment.

I appreciate the chairman's leadership on this effort, not only in the underlying bill but the amendment to improve upon it. I thank the gentleman for including my food access liaison provision in the amendment.

Just briefly: This individual will be tasked with coordinating USDA programs aimed at improving Americans' access to quality food and providing technical assistance to community leaders who are working to improve the lives of those living in food deserts. This is a small measure of progress that we can all be proud of and continue our work to ensure folks have access to healthy and nutritious foods.

However, I would be remiss if I didn't mention that access to healthy and nutritious food relies on the food security system, the strong food security system provided by this farm bill. And I thank the chairman for his leadership in that regard.

As we will soon vote on amendments, I urge my colleagues to remember the importance of a strong food security system for all of our commodities, whether that be under the ARC program or the PLC program for crops

such as rice, soybeans, and corn or the current sugar program. If we pick apart our commodity programs one by one, we will create giant holes in our Nation's food security system. This compromises our national security and hinders our ability to provide healthy, nutritious food, not just to rural communities that produce the food but to urban areas and, in fact, the entire Nation and beyond.

Mr. Chair, again, I want to thank the chairman for his diligence and leadership on this issue, and not only in regard to the commodity title but certainly the nutrition title, to our vice chairman and chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee, G.T. Thompson, for his diligence as well. And I appreciate the work on the part of our Agriculture Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chair, I have the honor of not only sitting on the Committee on Agriculture but also of sitting on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, so I know very well how important healthy, hunger-free children are to a good education system.

On top of already harmful policies, the Conaway manager's amendment compromises the current science-based nutrition standards in Federal schools meals programs. By politicizing and legislating nutrition standards, this amendment, if adopted, will further threaten the school meals programs upon which millions of children rely.

The USDA updated the current standards based on rigorous, evidence-based processes, as required by the last bipartisan Child Nutrition Reauthorization. These standards rely on expert, nonpartisan recommendations. Research shows that children are now eating 16 percent more vegetables and 23 percent more fruit at lunch. Further, according to a poll by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 97 percent of Americans support the National School Nutrition Standards and 86 percent say the School Nutrition Standards should stay or be strengthened.

There is simply no reason to depart from science-based and evidence-based standards. We should not compromise on what is best for our children. That is why the American Academy of Pediatrics, American Diabetes Association, American Heart Association, and others oppose rolling back the standards. I urge my colleagues to oppose these efforts that would further threaten the health of our Nation's children and students.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how many more speakers the gentleman from Texas might have.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I am ready to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, let me close by saying this manager's amendment highlights how deeply flawed this bill is. I regret very much that a flawed bill is being brought to the House floor because of a flawed process.

I am the ranking Democrat in the Nutrition Subcommittee. I didn't see the nutrition title until it was made public to the press. We had 23 hearings in the Agriculture Committee. This nutrition title does not reflect those hearings. We should have had a hearing on this nutrition title to understand the impacts that it will have on some of the most vulnerable people in this country.

We live in the richest country in the history of the world. We have millions of people who are food insecure or hungry. We have an obligation here in this House of Representatives to make sure that we don't let them fall through the cracks. And yet, we have this bill that will make hunger worse in America. This manager's amendment does nothing to fix it. In fact, in some cases it makes it worse.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject it but, more importantly, reject this bill. Send it back to committee. Let's do it right. Let's have a bipartisan bill, one that we can all be proud of.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, the gentlewoman just previously mentioned the increase in fruits and vegetables being eaten by children in school. I would point out that our bill includes \$1.2 billion in incentives to help moms and dads out there who are on SNAP to buy fruits and vegetables and dairy to get a bigger bang for their buck and thereby hopefully increasing those commodities.

Mr. Chair, we have a good bill here, the base bill. This simply makes it better. With that, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-679.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 18, strike subsection (a) and insert the following new subsection:

(a) DETERMINATION OF PAYMENT ACRES.—Subject to subsection (d), for the purpose of price loss coverage and agriculture risk coverage, the payment acres for each covered

commodity on a farm shall be equal to, with respect to base acres for the covered commodity on the farm—

- (1) for crop years 2019 and 2020, 85 percent of such base acres;
- (2) for crop year 2021, 76.5 percent of such base acres;
- (3) for crop year 2022, 68 percent of such base acres;
- (4) for crop year 2023, 59.5 percent of such base acres;
- (5) for crop year 2024, 51 percent of such base acres;
- (6) for crop year 2025, 42.5 percent of such base acres;
- (7) for crop year 2026, 34 percent of such base acres;
- (8) for crop year 2027, 25.5 percent of such base acres;
- (9) for crop year 2028, 17 percent of such base acres; and
- (10) for crop year 2029, 8.5 percent of such base acres.

Page 32, line 11, strike “2023” and insert “2029”.

Page 32, line 25, strike “2023” and insert “2029”.

Page 33, line 14, strike “2023” and insert “2029”.

Page 34, line 9, strike “2023” and insert “2029”.

Page 35, after line 16, insert the following new subsection:

(h) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may not make payments under this section after crop year 2029.

Page 35, line 23, strike “2023” and insert “2029”.

Page 38, line 10, strike “2023” and insert “2029”.

Page 40, after line 3, insert the following new subsection:

(h) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may not make payments under this section after crop year 2029.

Strike section 1301 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 1301. SUGAR POLICY.

(a) **PHASE OUT OF CURRENT PROGRAM AND LOAN RATES.**—

(1) **SUGARCANE.**—Section 156(a) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(a)) is amended—

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

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “2018” and inserting “2020”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

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

- “(5) 16.88 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2021 crop year;
- “(6) 15.01 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2022 crop year;
- “(7) 13.14 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2023 crop year;
- “(8) 11.27 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2024 crop year;
- “(9) 9.4 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2025 crop year;
- “(10) 7.53 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2021 crop year;
- “(11) 5.66 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2027 crop year;
- “(12) 3.79 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2028 crop year; and
- “(13) 1.92 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2029 crop year.”

(2) **SUGAR BEETS.**—Section 156(b)(2) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(b)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2029”.

(3) **TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVE PERIOD.**—Section 156(i) of the Federal Agriculture Im-

provement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(i)) is amended—

(A) by striking “2018” and inserting “2029”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The authority to carry out this section shall terminate on September 30, 2029.”

(b) **PHASE OUT OF FLEXIBLE MARKETING ALLOTMENTS FOR SUGAR.**—

(1) **SUGAR ESTIMATES.**—Section 359b(a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb(a)(1)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2029”.

(2) **SUGAR ALLOTMENTS.**—Section 359b(b)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb(b)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B);

(B) by striking “at a level that is” and inserting the following: “at a level equal to—

“(A) for crop year 2021, 76.5 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;

“(B) for crop year 2022, 68 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;

“(C) for crop year 2023, 59.5 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;

“(D) for crop year 2024, 51 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;

“(E) for crop year 2025, 42.5 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;

“(F) for crop year 2026, 34 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;

“(G) for crop year 2027, 25.5 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year; and

“(H) for crop year 2028, 17 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year.”

(3) **TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVE PERIOD.**—Section 359l(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359l(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking “2018” and inserting “2029”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The authority to carry out this part shall terminate on September 30, 2029.”

Page 85, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 86, line 2, and insert the following:

(3) **ELECTION OF PRODUCTION HISTORY COVERAGE PERCENTAGE.**—Section 1406(a)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9056(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) a percentage of coverage, in 5-percent increments, not exceeding, with respect to the production history of the participating dairy operation—

“(A) for calendar year 2019 and 2020, 90 percent;

“(B) for calendar year 2021, 81 percent;

“(C) for calendar year 2022, 72 percent;

“(D) for calendar year 2023, 63 percent;

“(E) for calendar year 2024, 54 percent;

“(F) for calendar year 2025, 45 percent;

“(G) for calendar year 2026, 36 percent;

“(H) for calendar year 2027, 27 percent;

“(I) for calendar year 2028, 18 percent; and

“(J) for calendar year 2029, 10 percent.”

Page 90, line 25, strike “2023” and insert “2029”.

Page 579, after 2, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 10006. PHASE OUT OF CROP INSURANCE PREMIUMS.

(a) **PHASE OUT OF PREMIUMS.**—Section 508(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and (7)” and inserting “(7), (9), and (10)”; and

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

“(9) **PHASE OUT OF PREMIUMS.**—Beginning with reinsurance year 2021, in determining the amount of premium to be paid under paragraphs (2), (6), and (7), the Corporation shall multiply the amount specified in subparagraphs (B)(i), (C)(i), (D)(i), (E)(i), (F)(i), (G)(i), and (H)(i) of paragraph (2), subparagraphs (A)(i), (B)(i), (C)(i), and (D)(i) of paragraph (6), and subparagraphs (A)(i), (B)(i), and (C)(i) of paragraphs (7), by—

“(A) in reinsurance year 2021, 0.9;

“(B) in reinsurance year 2022, 0.8;

“(C) in reinsurance year 2023, 0.7;

“(D) in reinsurance year 2024, 0.6;

“(E) in reinsurance year 2025, 0.5;

“(F) in reinsurance year 2026, 0.4;

“(G) in reinsurance year 2027, 0.3;

“(H) in reinsurance year 2028, 0.2; and

“(I) in reinsurance year 2029, 0.1.

“(10) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority to make payments under this subsection shall terminate on the first day of reinsurance year 2030.”

(b) **PHASE OUT OF ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATING COST REIMBURSEMENTS.**—Section 508(k)(4) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraphs (B), (C), (E), and (F); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraphs:

“(A) **REDUCTIONS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning with reinsurance year 2021, in calculating the rate established by the Board to reimburse approved insurance providers and agents for the administrative and operating costs of the providers and agents, the Secretary shall multiply the percent specified in subparagraph (A)(ii) by—

“(I) in reinsurance year 2021, 0.9;

“(II) in reinsurance year 2022, 0.8;

“(III) in reinsurance year 2023, 0.7;

“(IV) in reinsurance year 2024, 0.6;

“(V) in reinsurance year 2025, 0.5;

“(VI) in reinsurance year 2026, 0.4;

“(VII) in reinsurance year 2027, 0.3;

“(VIII) in reinsurance year 2028, 0.2; and

“(IX) in reinsurance year 2029, 0.1.

“(ii) **TERMINATION.**—The authority to make reimbursements under this paragraph shall terminate on the first day of reinsurance year 2030.

“(B) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2023, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that includes an assessment of whether reimbursements under this paragraph for administrative and operating costs are effective.”

SEC. 10007. REQUIREMENTS TO PROVIDE INSURANCE.

(a) **STACKED INCOME PROTECTION PLAN.**—Section 508B(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1508b(a)) is amended by striking “the Corporation shall” and inserting “the Corporation may”.

(b) **PEANUT REVENUE CROP INSURANCE.**—Section 508C(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1508c(a)) is amended by striking “the Corporation shall” and inserting “the Corporation may”.

(c) **UPDATE STANDARD REINSURANCE AGREEMENT.**—The Secretary shall update the 2019 Standard Reinsurance Agreement to include that the Company may offer and market all plans of insurance for all crops in any State where actuarial documents are available in which it writes an eligible crop insurance contract and shall accept and approve applications from all eligible producers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and

a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, farm subsidies, essentially taking money from taxpayers to inflate the price of their own groceries, was never a good idea. They are the poster children of corporate welfare since the vast proportion of them go to large corporations, not to small family farms. And 60 percent of American farms get no subsidies at all, contradicting the claim that somehow American agriculture couldn't exist without them.

We spend about \$20 billion a year subsidizing about 40 percent of our farms. That is \$160 a year out of the direct taxes of an average family in America, and that doesn't include the cost to consumers from higher prices. As we just heard, the sugar program alone costs taxpayers \$3.7 billion a year in higher sugar prices. That adds about \$30 more to their grocery bills.

Subsidies hurt taxpayers, they hurt consumers, and they even hurt farmers in the long run. The decline in farm economy since the last farm bill ought to warn us we are doing something wrong.

Prices are signals sent by consumers over what they want to buy and the amount that they are willing to pay. If left alone, they tell producers what consumers want more of and what they want less of. If consumers want less soybeans and sugar and more wheat and cabbage, prices for soybeans and sugar decline and prices for wheat and cabbage increase. Producers respond by planting less soybeans and sugarcane and more wheat and cabbage, unless—unless—the government distorts those price signals through subsidies. Producers end up planting more of what consumers don't want and less of what they do. Thus, producers are artificially induced to perform below their potential productivity.

Many of the subsidies today are in the form of crop insurance. Farmers get heavily subsidized insurance to guarantee them profits for their products. Who pays those subsidies? Taxpayers. What is insurance? It is the monetization of risk. It is the way markets assign a dollar value to the risk that one undertakes in any human enterprise. The higher the risk, the more expensive the insurance.

By subsidizing crop insurance, we once again corrupt the price signals that farmers need to make rational decisions. If crop insurance for soybeans is expensive, the market is warning farmers not to rely on soybeans. If taxpayers subsidize the cost of that insurance to lower its price, we are encouraging very risky behavior by masking the cost of that risk.

Once again, that produces bad outcomes for taxpayers, for consumers, and ultimately the farmers themselves because they have been led toward higher risk by distorted price signals.

Nor is subsidized insurance necessary for farm loans. Bankers loan to other

non-subsidized parts of the farm economy without subsidized insurance. There are no good arguments for continuing these subsidies. Most farmers don't get them right now. Those who do tend to be major corporations and not family farmers.

□ 1600

Now, my amendment preserves subsidies for the next 2 years and then gradually phases them out over the next 10 years, assuring that producers who have grown dependent on these subsidies have plenty of time to adjust their operations. But at the end of this 12-year process, we have a much more efficiently functioning agricultural market that is accurately responding to the needs of consumers rather than to the whims of government bureaucrats.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I oppose this amendment.

I was here in 1996 when we tried something similar to this. It wasn't as extreme, but it was supposed to save us a little bit of money.

Does the gentleman remember?

It ended up costing us five times more than what we saved because it didn't work.

This is a fantasy that is out there for some people. People have no clue how much it costs to farm nowadays, what kind of risks you take in farming. And if you want to make sure that we have a few people farm this whole country, this is the way to do it, because, without crop insurance, without these other backstops, young people and ordinary people will not be able to farm. The people who will farm are people with deep pockets, and that is not what we want in this country.

I oppose this amendment.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, where do I begin? I guess it was JFK who said the farmer is the only businessman who—I think he said it this way—who buys retail, sells wholesale, and pays freight both ways.

So we are comparing apples and oranges here with a business that is, say, I don't know, an accountant maybe—I don't know, Mr. Chairman—and a farmer. Farming is inherently risky, so that is not even debatable.

The issue we have here, though, is it worth it to us as a nation to make an investment in our national security?

Our ability to feed ourselves is absolutely crucial to our national security,

number one. Number two, we support our farmers at a fraction of what the rest of the world does, and so we get much better value, much better return on investment.

I think the disposable income of an average American is somewhere in the 12 percent range, what we spend on food; and if you think about and compare it to, say, in Europe where they are upwards of 20 percent and Japan in the 25 percent range of their disposable income, we get a much better return, much, much better value to the taxpayer.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the former chairman of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, why do we invest in agriculture? Because the ability to eat, to feed ourselves is one of the most fundamentally important things that goes on in an economy. We make those investments so that we will always have a sufficient supply of the highest quality food and fiber at the most affordable prices.

Empires, countries, republics, democracies have been destroyed throughout history when they lost their ability to feed themselves.

I will tell you a strong farm bill, the investment we make is one of the key foundations to protecting the Constitution, just like our responsibilities to have a standing army to defend the coast, to defend the airspace, to defend our folks.

Maybe you don't want to make that investment, maybe you are willing to take a chance, but when we don't have enough to eat, it will be too late to fix the problem.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would remind the ranking member that the reason the 1996 Freedom to Farm bill ended up costing us more is because we ended up adding a whole new series of subsidies to it. Experience is important to heed.

New Zealand has four times more dependency on agriculture than the United States—they are four times more dependent—and it once maintained an extensive subsidy program just like ours. In 1984, New Zealand ended those subsidies. Well, what happened? Farm productivity rose, farm earnings rose, farm output all rose.

What did New Zealand farmers who opposed the ending of subsidies say once those subsidies were removed and the economy responded? The Federated Farmers of New Zealand says that it "thoroughly debunked the myth that the farming sector cannot prosper without government subsidies."

Mr. Chairman, it is long past time to debunk that same myth in our own country, restore to consumers the power to command what producers grow, and restore to producers the accurate price signals they need to maximize their productivity in a free and undistorted market.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, we have got a clear-cut choice: you either want American producers to produce American food or you don't. That is what this is simply about.

When I think about the farm bill, you can love it or hate the safety net we have in place, but it works—as the chairman said, the lowest cost price food in the developed world.

Here is why that is important. Half of America works paycheck to paycheck. Their food budget is where they flex. Their rent doesn't change. Their house payment doesn't change. Their car payment doesn't change. But if something comes up in the middle of the month, it is coming out of that food budget.

I don't want to make that mom's job any tougher than it already is by raising the cost of food arbitrarily, capriciously, by ignoring the vast amount of competition around this world that is fundamentally unfair.

If we could go to that utopia that my friend from California would like to get us to, fantastic, but we can't do that. They barely could do it in New Zealand, for goodness' sake. We could not do that against the rest of the world.

I would argue that U.S. production is a bit more complicated than whatever New Zealand might or might not be doing. We have got to compete in a world global market against foreign treasuries that are spending stunningly more money than we are.

China spent \$100 billion on three products in 1 year to subsidize their products. Now, did that send the wrong signal to those folks? Yes, it did. We farmers and our rice farmers and our other producers have to compete against the prices that are depressed like that.

We can't go against the rest of the world. If the rest of the world will go to a level playing field, I have got not one farmer out there who would say: No, no, no, we want to keep it in place. They want to compete in the cash market. That is where they want to make their money. This amendment would strip them of the ability to do that. We would go to foreign-imported food coming at us with standards that are not remotely close to ours, labor that is not closely protected the way ours is.

Let's defeat this McClintock amendment, show the American farmer and rancher out there, who works as hard as anybody in this world, who thinks a 20-hour workweek is something they do in their second or third job in order to keep the farm going, let's show them that we support them. Let's show them that we have got their back.

A "yes" vote for McClintock says: Never mind, we don't care about you. A "no" vote on McClintock says exactly the message we want to send, and I am hopeful this is a stunningly large vote so that American producers out there, who are some of the hardest working, best people on the face of the Earth, can understand that this Congress understands the unfair foreign competition that they are competing with.

Vote "no" on McClintock.

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

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

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LAHOOD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed House Report 115-679.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title I, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1612. ONE-TIME FILING FOR ARC AND PLC.

(a) ONE-TIME FILING.—Except as provided in subsection (b), during the first enrollment period announced by the Farm Service Agency after the date of the enactment of this Act, producers on a farm may file a one-time program contract with the Secretary to enroll in agricultural risk coverage or price loss coverage through crop year 2023.

(b) UPDATED PROGRAM CONTRACT REQUIRED.—In the case of a change in a farming operation for which producers on a farm have filed a one-time program contract pursuant to subsection (a), such producers shall file an updated program contract with the Secretary not later than one year after such change in the farming operation occurs.

(c) NOTICE OF OTHER ANNUAL REPORTING.—The Secretary shall provide to each producer that files a one-time program contract pursuant to subsection (a) a notice that includes the annual and other periodic reporting requirements applicable to such producer, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) REGULATIONS REVISED.—The Secretary shall—

- (1) issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section; and
- (2) revise section 1412.41 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, in accordance with this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have introduced would streamline a burdensome regulatory requirement currently in place for two USDA programs. The first is the Agriculture Risk Coverage, or ARC, and the Price Loss Coverage, or PLC. My amendment changes the signup process from an annual signup process to a one-and-done process for the duration of the 5-year farm bill.

Our farmers work tirelessly to provide food for our families, our country,

and to grow products that are shipped all over the world. From raising livestock to growing crops such as soybeans and corn, they contribute to the lifeblood of my State of Illinois and also our national economy.

To fully support the agriculture community, we must maintain an efficient and effective program and programs that allow our farmers to be globally competitive. Given the tremendous impact of the agriculture industry on the U.S. economy, we must work to ensure that our farmers are able to operate without burdensome and time-consuming regulatory requirements.

My district in central and west-central Illinois is the eighth largest district in terms of corn and soybean production in the country, and I hear from my farmers across my district and from my own agriculture advisory committee that the amount of time spent filling out paperwork for these programs, even when there is no change to their farming operation, takes up too much of their valuable time which could be used on their farms.

Under the current rules, to file an annual contract, farmers need to collect signatures from landlords or other individuals with an interest in the land. Many landlords reside out of the State or out of the country, making this paperwork burdensome and very difficult in many cases.

Under our amendment, farmers will be able to and be eligible for a one-time signup for ARC and PLC for the duration of the 5-year farm bill so long as there are no changes to the current farming operation. If a farmer does make changes to their farming operation, they must reflect those changes in a new signup, as is the current process. This simple fix will help our farmers spend more time farming and less time filling out paperwork.

I want to thank Chairman CONAWAY and his staff for working with me on this amendment, and I appreciate all of his support for this commonsense reform that is so important to our farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I don't oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chair, this is common sense, and I support this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115-679.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 113, line 5, strike "inserting a semicolon" and insert "inserting 'and'".

Page 113, strike lines 7 through 16 and insert the following:

"(F) each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, no more than 24,000,000 acres.";

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, though I plan to withdraw this amendment, I seek to enter into a colloquy with my good friend, Chairman CONAWAY, regarding the Conservation Reserve Program and to express concern with the number of acres authorized in the CRP program in H.R. 2.

Chairman CONAWAY has been a strong chairman and a leader for America's farmers, and for that I would like to thank him.

CRP is a well-intended program that has a place in protecting sensitive lands; however, the program should not be expanded beyond levels currently authorized in the Agriculture Act of 2014.

The Agriculture Act of 2014 reduced the national CRP acreage cap from 32 million acres to 27.5 million acres in 2014 and to 24 million acres in 2018. H.R. 2 would then increase this cap by 1 million acres each year to a maximum enrollment of 29 million acres by 2023.

USDA's Farm Service Agency's CRP enrollment data reveals that, for the 2016 fiscal year, 23.9 million acres were enrolled in CRP, representing approximately 7 percent of the U.S. cropland. Rental rates and leases offered by the Federal Government are often much more lucrative than farming would be.

While congressional directives and a favorable farm economy in prior years led to lower CRP enrollment, nearly one-quarter of all land enrolled in CRP has been enrolled for more than 20 years, including 2.7 million acres, or 12 percent, enrolled for more than three decades since the inception of the program. During the 2016 fiscal year, payments for CRP lands totaled \$1.7 billion.

As our Nation's farmers and ranchers face the challenge of meeting the increasing demand for food and fiber in the U.S. and abroad, I ask the chairman: Should America's producers be forced to continue competing with Federal programs for access to farmland?

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and

I thank him for bringing up this important issue.

I agree with the gentleman from Alabama that our farmers and ranchers should not be competing with the Federal Government for viable cropland. H.R. 2 makes many changes to the CRP program, such as capping the rental rate payment to 80 percent of the county average and stepping this percentage down for subsequent reenrollments of the same tract.

I understand, however, the gentleman's concerns with the increase in enrolled acres, and I commit to working with the gentleman and his staff on this issue during the coming conference report, should we get there.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for his leadership and commitment.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

□ 1615

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. FASO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115-679.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 2407. SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES CONSERVATION.

The Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (16 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 5(e), by striking "and December 31, 2015" and inserting "December 31, 2015, and December 31, 2022";

(2) in section 6(d), by striking " , respectively" and inserting " , and a program update shall be completed by December 31, 2023";

(3) in section 7—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking "and 2016" and inserting " , 2016, and 2022"; and

(B) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "and 2017" and inserting " , 2017, and 2023";

(4) in section 10, by striking "2018" and inserting "2023";

(5) by redesignating sections 8 through 10 as sections 9 through 11, respectively; and

(6) by inserting after section 7 the following:

"SEC. 8. CONSERVATION PROGRAMS ASSESSMENT.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In coordination with the appraisal of soil, water, and related resources and with the national soil and water conservation program established under this Act, the Secretary may carry out a conservation effects assessment project to quantify the environmental and economic effects of conservation practices, develop the science base for managing the agricultural landscape for environmental quality and sustainable productive capacity, and improve the efficacy of conservation practices and programs by evaluating conservation effects.

"(b) SCOPE.—The project under this subsection may be carried out at national, regional, and watershed scales, and may include cropland, grazing lands, wetlands, forests, and such other lands as the Secretary may determine appropriate.

"(c) ACTIVITIES.—The project under this subsection may include research, literature reviews and bibliographies, modeling, assessment, monitoring and data collection, outreach, extension education, and such other activities as the Secretary may determine appropriate.

"SEC. 9. GOALS AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS FOR CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.

"(a) NATURAL RESOURCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In coordination with the appraisal of soil, water, and related resources, the soil and water conservation program, and the conservation effects assessment project established by this Act, the Secretary shall identify, and periodically revise, specific natural resource and environmental objectives and anticipated conservation outcomes and results, by resource concern, for the conservation programs established under subtitles D and H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 and the landscape conservation initiatives developed by the Secretary.

"(2) ASSESSMENTS.—To help measure outcomes and results, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, make assessments of changes in the status and conditions of natural resources and the environment that result from the application of conservation activities supported directly by such conservation programs and initiatives.

"(3) MONITORING AND PROGRAM EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall establish a coordinated monitoring and evaluation process for programs and initiatives to assess progress toward the identified objectives, to gather information to improve program and initiative implementation in accordance with desired program and initiative outcomes and results, and to assess the need for modifications to program or initiative rules or statutes.

"(b) MONITORING AND PROGRAM EVALUATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a comprehensive monitoring and program evaluation process to assess progress in reaching natural resource and environmental objectives identified in accordance with subsection (a) and the contribution of individual programs and initiatives, as well as the programs and initiatives collectively, to that progress.

"(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—In implementing the monitoring and program evaluation process under paragraph (1), the Secretary may consider and incorporate resource concern inventories, quality criteria, conservation practices and enhancements, and such other information as the Secretary determines relevant for applying the monitoring and program evaluation process across each of the major land uses identified by the Secretary.

"(3) MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROCESS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue a design for the comprehensive monitoring and evaluation process, a schedule for implementing the process, and a plan for coordinating the process with the national soil and water conservation program and conservation effects assessment project established under this Act.

"(B) METHODOLOGY.—The design for the monitoring and evaluation process shall—

“(i) include detailed information concerning the requisite frequency of the monitoring process at the field, water body, habitat, or other level and the manner in which the data will be aggregated at the landscape or watershed level, county or local level, State level, national level, and any other level the Secretary determines necessary; and

“(ii) take into account the cumulative nature of conservation over time, the interactions and sequencing effects between conservation activities, the differing times for conservation effects to be realized, and other related measurement challenges.

“(C) PUBLIC RESEARCH.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to facilitate implementation of the monitoring and evaluation process, the Secretary shall make available conservation activity and program data to cooperators and researchers engaged in public research and evaluation activities to improve conservation outcomes under this subsection, provided that—

“(i) adequate assurances are provided to the Secretary that any resulting research or information will be made publicly available and in a form that protects personally identifiable information; and

“(ii) the National Technical Committee finds that any such research is likely to generate information that furthers the purpose of this section.

“(4) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may implement the monitoring evaluation process in part through cooperative or contribution agreements with Federal, State, and local agencies, universities and colleges, nongovernmental organizations with requisite expertise, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the National Technical Committee.

“(5) NATIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE.—

“(A) COMPOSITION.—The monitoring and evaluation process shall be administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service with assistance from a national technical committee appointed by the Secretary and composed of individuals with relevant technical and scientific expertise representing—

“(i) the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture;

“(ii) the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture;

“(iii) the Farm Service Agency of the Department of Agriculture;

“(iv) the Forest Service;

“(v) the National Institute for Food and Agriculture;

“(vi) the United States Geological Survey;

“(vii) State and tribal agencies;

“(viii) land grant university natural resource research programs;

“(ix) nongovernmental organizations with expertise in the full array of conservation issues and measurement and evaluation of conservation outcomes; and

“(x) such other agencies, institutions, or organizations as the Secretary may determine appropriate.

“(B) FACA EXEMPTION.—The national technical committee shall be exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

“(C) TRANSPARENCY.—The Secretary shall ensure the proceedings and recommendations of the national technical committee are available to the public.

“(6) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure that any on-farm monitoring activities that may be included as part of the monitoring and program evaluation process are voluntary on the part of the producer, and may include appropriate compensation, as determined by the Secretary.

“(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to

carry out this subsection, for each fiscal year, the amount that is equal to one percent of the total annual funding from the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation made available in the preceding fiscal year for the conservation programs established under subtitles D and H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, excluding the conservation reserve program.

“(C) REPORTING.—

“(1) REPORT ON OBJECTIVES AND METHODS.—Beginning in the fiscal year that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and periodically thereafter, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary shall submit to Congress, and make publicly available, a report that includes—

“(A) a description of conservation outcome objectives that are, to the maximum extent practicable, quantifiable, measurable, and time-bound for each program established under subtitle D or H of the Food Security Act of 1985 and the landscape conservation initiatives developed by the Secretary;

“(B) a description of the approaches, tools, and methods used to measure or model the conservation outcomes and results and to estimate the cost-effectiveness of each such program; and

“(C) guidance to the conservation project partners working to implement conservation programs within a landscape-level project that provides a description of the approaches, tools, and methods the partners might consider using to measure and model the conservation outcomes and results of their projects.

“(2) REPORT ON OUTCOMES.—In conjunction with each of the reports to Congress pursuant to section 7, the Secretary shall submit to Congress, and make publicly available, a report that includes—

“(A) an assessment of progress made towards achieving conservation program objectives and anticipated outcomes and results for each conservation program established under subtitle D or H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as well as for such programs collectively, and the landscape conservation initiatives developed by the Secretary;

“(B) an evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of each such conservation program and initiative; and

“(C) recommendations, in light of the assessment and evaluation, to improve program implementation and improve the scientific and economic tools (including any new or revised conservation practices, conservation enhancements, or conservation planning tools) used to achieve stated natural resource conservation and environmental objectives.

“(3) COORDINATION.—The Secretary may coordinate the reports required under paragraphs (1) and (2) with any reports developed as part of the conservation effects assessment project authorized by section 8, whenever such coordination is feasible and warranted, as determined by the Secretary.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which would provide the USDA the tools it needs to quantifiably measure conservation outcomes.

These provisions are substantively the same as a bipartisan bill I introduced earlier this year with Representative MARCIA FUDGE.

If included in the farm bill, my amendment would have the USDA measure, evaluate, and report on various conservation programs across the Nation. This information is necessary to help define, evaluate, and justify taxpayer return on conservation investment programs.

Right now, the USDA can provide information on the impact of our conservation programs in terms of contracts and acres, but they lack the ability to provide the actual impact of these programs on important resource concerns. By ensuring that the USDA has all of the tools necessary to collect this information, we can better protect and preserve these programs into the future.

The USDA's voluntary conservation programs are consistently helping farmers in initiatives that protect natural resources while also increasing farm productivity. This amendment would ensure that the USDA can continue to improve existing conservation programs and practices while also supporting our Nation's farmers.

Mr. Chairman, we will also seek, in response to concerns that have been raised by the Farm Bureau, to, in conference, further refine the privacy provisions relating to the research activities that would take place under this bill to ensure that any personally identifiable information that would be contained within the analysis of conservation programs is further protected by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CONAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, Mr. FASO has my commitment to work with him to address the Farm Bureau's concerns to get them to the point that they are okay with this. I support the gentleman's amendment under those terms.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, I am encouraged by the support for my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115-679.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115-679.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 250, strike line 25 and all that follows through line 13 on page 253.

Page 253, line 14, strike “(G) 15-PERCENT” and insert “(F) 5-PERCENT”.

Page 254, line 25, strike “15 percent” and insert “5 percent”.

Page 256, line 17, strike “and” at the end.
 Page 256, after line 17 insert the following:
 (ii) by striking “age six” and inserting “3 years of age”, and
 Page 256, line 18, strike “(ii)” and insert “(iii)”.

Page 257, line 2, strike “or (G) a pregnant woman.” and insert “(G) a married individual who is responsible for a dependent individual and who resides in the household with a spouse who complies with the requirements of paragraph (1)(B); or (H) a pregnant woman.”.

Page 257, line 9, strike “(iii)” and insert “(iv)”.

Page 257 line 25, strike the close quotation marks, the comma, and “and”.

Page 257, after line 25, insert the following:
 “(iii) E-VERIFY.—An employment and training program designed by the State agency may not be approved unless such program requires that each individual who participates in such program is permitted to engage in employment in the United States on the basis of the status of such individual as determined under the employment verification system in effect under section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a).”, and

Page 260, strike lines 24 and 25, and insert the following:

- (1) in subsection (e)—
- (A) in paragraph (5)—
- (i) in subparagraph (A) by striking “age 6” and inserting “age 3 or of an incapacitated person”, and
- (ii) in subparagraph (B) by striking “of 5” and inserting “of 2”,
- (B) in paragraph (7) by striking “or” at the end,
- (C) in paragraph (8) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”, and
- (D) and by adding at the end the following:
 “(9) is a married individual who is responsible for a dependent individual and who resides in the household with a spouse who complies with the requirements of subsection (d)(1).”, and

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does two things: It increases from 20 percent to 70 percent the percentage of able-bodied adults in SNAP that would be required to comply with the work requirements in the bill, and it requires the use of the E-Verify system to assure that work training is available only to legal residents in this country who are legally entitled to work.

H.R. 2 provides for a requirement that work-capable, nonemployed adults look for work or train for work in order to receive SNAP benefits. That is important. When Maine implemented a work requirement for able-bodied welfare recipients, they found that 84 percent of this population left the welfare rolls and, within a year, had doubled their effective pay. Alabama saw the same results.

Unfortunately, H.R. 2 would only engage about 20 percent of this population—20 percent. This amendment would boost the work participation rate to 70 percent of able-bodied adults in the program. It does so by imple-

menting changes recommended by The Heritage Foundation.

H.R. 2's work requirement affects parents of children under age 6. This amendment reduces the exemption to those with children under age 3 but with an important difference: H.R. 2's requirements extend the work requirements to both spouses of children under the age of 6. This, in effect, is a marriage penalty that treats married couples as if they were single.

The amendment I offer applies to only one spouse in the family, allowing the parents to share domestic and work responsibilities between themselves in any manner they feel is appropriate. This recognizes, encourages, and rewards marriage as the stable and nurturing environment that it is.

H.R. 2 allows States to waive the work requirement in geographic areas defined by them with higher-than-normal unemployment rates above 6 percent. This amendment deletes the waiver for an important reason: Where there is high unemployment, there is also more reason to encourage job training and job searching in order to equip recipients to compete in tighter job markets. Sidelining these individuals is self-defeating both for them and for the local economies.

Also, the amendment removes the ability of States to define these geographic areas in a manner that would defeat the work requirement in the first place.

H.R. 2 also allows States to exempt 15 percent of the able-bodied population from this work requirement. This amendment takes it to 5 percent.

Finally, this amendment requires that SNAP recipients be screened by the E-Verify system to assure that training is going only to those who are obeying our laws and are legally in this country. This requirement is essential to the enforcement of our immigration laws. Otherwise, we are spending taxpayer money to train illegal immigrants whom Federal law prohibits from being employed.

This amendment transforms the work requirement in H.R. 2 from an empty and symbolic gesture covering just one-fifth of the able-bodied population receiving food stamps to more than 70 percent.

It rewards, rather than penalizes, married couples and recognizes that the shared responsibilities of marriage are one of the single greatest factors in reducing poverty. Children born into homes with single parents are five times more likely to live in poverty. It is time our policies reflected the importance of marriage in protecting our children.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to

the amendment by my good friend and colleague from California. I do that respectfully.

H.R. 2 includes a substantive, enforceable, and supportive work requirement for work-capable adults 18 to 59. That is 20 percent of the population, 6 million individuals.

Waivers and exemptions were modified and even tightened to ensure that only the most vulnerable work-capable adults were waived from the requirement. Waivers take into consideration those areas with excessively high rates of unemployment, while exemptions assist those who need short-term reprieve because of temporary hardship.

Allowing for married couples to fulfill one requirement disengages recipients from the workforce. Work is more than just a paycheck. It provides dignity, social impact, opportunity, and creates the only path to self-sufficiency. One spouse fulfilling a 20-hour-per-week requirement does not lead to self-sufficiency. It does the exact opposite; it creates a lifetime dependency trap.

H.R. 2 provides equitable treatment to all households when promoting work, including those that house cohabiting adults or married adults.

Currently, 42 States choose not to use education and training funds to invest in childcare, which is an allowable investment. Reducing the age of the child from 6 to 3 is an undeniable barrier that disincentivizes employment more so than the current programming.

Requiring education and training providers to use E-Verify on all participants who depend on them for services is just plain cruel. SNAP has eligibility standards in place, and illegal immigrants are not eligible for benefits. This is simply a means to shut out the very organizations and entities that provide these necessary supports for individuals in need.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO).

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the impetus behind the gentleman from California's amendment, but I think this amendment, if it were adopted, would threaten to destroy the carefully constructed efforts that we have endeavored to engage in in the committee to create something that was realistic and achievable.

Lowering the age from 6 to 3 will make it much more difficult for many SNAP families to comply with the work requirements, and reducing the ability of a State to have a waiver of up to 15 percent of the population will also make it extremely difficult, by reducing that number down to 5 percent.

So I think what the committee did was have a finely balanced effort to try

to move more able-bodied people into work and into training. While the gentleman's motivations are certainly fine in this regard and he is attempting to get at the right thing, we think that the amendment, if it were adopted, would actually destroy the carefully constructed effort that we have made to try to encourage work and responsibility.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chairman, 42, 23, 89, 200, and 3. These numbers stand out for me. Forty-two million people will be impacted by the SNAP changes; 23 hearings; 89 witnesses, who didn't recommend the proposals that we are seeing today; \$200 million spent on 10 pilot programs, of which we won't get the results in time; and 3 years old, the age that we are reducing down from 6 for parents to go to work.

These numbers just don't add up. And one of my concerns is that great proposals might be put on the floor right now, but we had a process, and the process has been flawed, and now we have a flawed product.

So, again, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to come back together in the great tradition of the Agriculture Committee and work on a bipartisan piece of legislation that moves Americans into work—meaningful work.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the right to close.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my colleague on the House Budget Committee.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank again the gentleman from California for bringing forth this amendment and the gentleman from Texas for all of the work that he did on the bill.

I think sometimes, rather than have hearings, you find out a lot more about these Federal programs and particularly the SNAP program if you talk to the local clerks at the convenience stores and the grocery stores and the income maintenance workers in the counties or the people who manage the low-income housing to find out what really is going on here.

I will bring to light one in particular of the four provisions in the amendment: the idea that participants in training programs have to go through E-Verify.

It has been said that you have to be a citizen to get SNAP anyway. I would suggest talking to some of the income maintenance workers or some of the people who talk to some of the people who use the SNAP program, and I think they will tell you that, whatever

the official Federal law is, SNAP is routinely used by people who are not here legally.

I think by requiring E-Verify for the training programs, we begin to go through the process of making sure that people who are in this country illegally are not taking advantage of taxpayer-funded programs.

□ 1630

I really wish we had more information on this topic, but, again, it is my belief that the average clerk in an average convenience store knows a lot more about the SNAP program than most Ph.D.s in sociology.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I ask support in opposing this amendment from my friend and colleague from California.

To my friends across the aisle who keep asking for bipartisan opportunity, you blew the first one. That was in subcommittee, where we could have amendments, and we are not seeing amendments from Members here. So there has been plenty of opportunity for bipartisan work.

I do appreciate the recommendations that my Democratic friends made in writing to both the ranking member and the chairman. All of those points and all the titles, I believe, were—I know in the nutrition title they were all incorporated into the base bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AMENDMENT NO. 7 OUT OF SEQUENCE DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 900, amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115-679 may be considered out of sequence.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 900 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1632

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115-679 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115-679.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 187, after line 10, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly):

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is in the national interests of the United States to advance food security in developing countries and open new markets for agricultural trade through programs that leverage the unique capabilities of Federal departments and agencies, and improve coordination between donors, beneficiaries, and the private sector.

(2) ROLE OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—The Department of Agriculture plays an important role in establishing trade between the United States and other nations and should enhance its role in facilitating the transfer of the knowledge, skills, and experience of American farmers, land-grant universities, and extension services through the

John Ogonowski and Doug Bereuter Farmer-To-Farmer Program under title V of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1737).

Page 187, strike lines 11 through 14 and insert the following:

(b) CLARIFICATION OF NATURE OF ASSISTANCE.—Section 501(b)(1) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1737(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting “technical” before “assistance”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(A) by striking “; and” at the end of clause (viii); and

(B) by striking clause (ix) and inserting the following:

“(ix) agricultural education and extension;

“(x) selection of seed varieties and plant stocks;

“(xi) knowledge of insecticide and sanitation procedures to prevent crop destruction;

“(xii) use and maintenance of agricultural equipment and irrigation systems; and

“(xiii) selection of fertilizers and methods of soils treatment; and”.

Page 189, after line 6, insert the following:

(g) CROP YIELDS AND INNOVATIVE PARTNERSHIPS.—Section 501 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1737) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) ESTABLISHMENT OF A GEOGRAPHICALLY DEFINED CROP YIELD METRICS.—The Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, should—

“(1) establish a geographically defined crop yield metrics system to assess improvements in crop yields in countries and areas receiving assistance under this title; and

“(2) store the data resulting from such geographically defined crop yield metrics system in a publicly available Internet database system.

“(g) GRANT PROGRAM TO CREATE NEW PARTNERS AND INNOVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall develop a grant program for fiscal years 2019 through 2023 to facilitate new and innovative partnerships and activities under this title.

“(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant recipients under this subsection shall use such funds—

“(A) to prioritize new implementing partners;

“(B) on innovative volunteer models;

“(C) on strategic partnerships with other United States development programs; and

“(D) on expanding the footprint and impact of the programs and activities under this title, and diversity among program participants, including land grant colleges or universities and extension services.

“(h) APPROPRIATIONS.—None of the amounts made available to carry out this title may be used to carry out subsections (f) and (g) of this section except to the extent that such subsections are carried out using authorities otherwise provided by this title.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, first, let me thank my good friend Chairman CONAWAY for working with us on this very important amendment.

Mr. Chair, I would like to share a story with you. I just got off the phone with Archie Devor from Lincoln, Nebraska. Archie grew up as a dairy farmer. He started milking cows at 12 and, up at 12 a.m., got slapped in the face

quite a lot with a wet tail. He put himself through college doing that and went on and earned a Ph.D. in dairy science.

He did agricultural extension work for 20 years and became involved with a very important United States Government program called Farmer-to-Farmer.

One of Archie's experiences was in Bangladesh. Bangladesh has as many dairy cows as we do in the United States, and we have 12 times the production capacity as they do.

Through Archie's work, through the techniques that he has provided them, particularly nutrition guidance, he has helped solve one of those problems that exists around the world with structural poverty and not enough to eat.

In fact, the Bangladeshis wanted to name him “Father of modern dairy.” He is a humble man, my constituent, and I am proud of his work. And, of course, he refuses that title.

Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us today addresses this very important program. This program has connected volunteer American farmers, agriculture extension experts, and others with deep knowledge of agriculture production with farmers abroad as well as agricultural experts from American universities to other countries around the globe.

The sharing of America's agricultural expertise dramatically enhances the capacity of people elsewhere to grow their own food.

Really, Mr. Chairman, this initiative is about three things. It is about the richness of America's farm experience. It is about an engine of economic regeneration in the fight against structural global poverty. And it also, I believe, will enhance our 21st century architecture of emerging diplomatic relations.

This program was initially authorized in 1985, and it has been in subsequent farm bills and, again, has promoted sustainable economic growth, food security, and agricultural development worldwide.

All 50 States have been represented in volunteer trips overseas to assist farmers, and specialists from a variety of agricultural disciplines have taught host-country farmers in over 100 nations through coordination with 12,000 different local host organizations.

The growth of the program has fostered community ecosystems of sustainable agriculture. It has enhanced the ability to access new markets and conserved environmental and natural resources. The work of our American farmers has borne great fruit overseas, and, with some innovative rethinking, I think we can help fully realize this program's potential.

This amendment serves three critical objectives.

First, it elevates the role of the United States Department of Agriculture in coordinating sequencing and prioritizing farmer visits to host countries.

Second, it establishes geographically defined crop yield metrics, a system to assess whether improvements in crop yields in countries receiving our assistance are actually occurring.

Third, the data generated through this new metric will be available publicly.

It is important to note that the amendment enhances outreach to identify and prioritize new implementing partners, increases the diversity of program participants, and serves to expand recruitment of new volunteers from diverse agricultural knowledge and skill backgrounds.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment will also better support our work in global food security programs that already exist and have wide congressional backing. We have an important moment here to renew, innovate, and modernize a very good program.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

This actually is America at her best. It is taking American expertise, going people-to-people across this world, and sharing the great techniques we are developing here. And while that might make those host countries a little more competitive with our production of agriculture here in America, it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment, and I appreciate Mr. FORTENBERRY's dedication not only to this specific issue but his broader work across the international arena that he has shown his expertise in.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for his comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MACARTHUR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 115-679.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 247, line 23, strike “(I)” and insert “(J)”.

Page 256, line 13, strike the close quotation marks and the comma at the end.

Page 256, after line 13, insert the following:

“(I) HOUSEHOLD INELIGIBILITY.—If an individual becomes ineligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program as a household member due to failure to meet the requirements under subparagraph (B), the remaining household members (including children), shall not become ineligible to apply to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program due to such individual's ineligibility.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee for his help and support and for crafting a farm bill that I think will benefit a great many Americans.

Mr. Chair, this bill benefits both farmers and consumers across the country. Even in a densely populated State like mine, New Jersey, the most densely populated State in the Nation, I have over 800 family farms that will benefit from this bill.

I have cranberry and blueberry growers that will benefit from specialty crop grants. Our main State university, Rutgers, will benefit from research grants. There are crop insurance provisions, conservation measures, things that will benefit all of us.

But let's face it: the most controversial part of this bill, or at least one of the most controversial parts, has been the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP.

Of the \$867 billion of authorized spending over the next 10 years, \$664 billion, or more than 75 percent, is for this one program.

This has been bipartisan, up until now at least. It has always been that the Federal Government would partner with States to help the most vulnerable people in the Nation, and, at the same time, we would help those people towards self-sufficiency, help them prepare to enter the workforce so that they can have the dignity that comes with a job. I think every American deserves this.

We have always balanced both compassion and individual responsibility, and I think this bill goes a long way to continuing in that tradition.

My amendment is about children. It is imperative, as we continue this balance, that no child gets caught up, even unintentionally, in something harmful. No child can go to school on an empty stomach and learn, and no child should have to come home from school and wonder where their next meal is coming from.

There is a lot in this bill already that protects children. I recognize that. I recognize that the committee has been very attentive to this. My amendment goes a little farther and makes it explicitly clear to those who administer the SNAP programs around the country that children cannot be harmed in any way.

I will read the relevant part of the amendment. It says: "If an individual becomes ineligible to participate in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program as a household member due to failure to meet the requirements under subparagraph (B), the remaining household members (including children), shall not become ineligible to apply to participate in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program due to such individual's ineligibility."

In other words, kids are off limits.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment even though I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I do want to say a few words, and that is, I am trying to understand this amendment, because I really don't understand the point of it.

Under current law, children can still get SNAP even if their parents fail to comply with work requirements. That is the current law. H.R. 2, the farm bill, does nothing to change this, so I am unsure why this amendment has been offered.

I think I would classify this amendment as a covering-your-rear-end amendment, because the bottom line is that there is a lot in H.R. 2 that I think does harm to children, because when their parents are thrown off of SNAP, while they may not be thrown off of SNAP, the overall household allowance for food gets decreased, and so there is less food for the entire family.

I would say that if the majority really cared about the impact H.R. 2 would have on children, then they would address the changes that have been made in broad-based categorical eligibility, which will throw working parents off of SNAP.

According to CBO, the nonpartisan experts that we rely on to give us data, over 265,000 students will lose access to free school meals.

So there is nothing to be opposed to, I guess, because this is already current law. But I would say to the gentleman that broad-based categorical eligibility, the changes in this bill, are going to adversely impact a number of individuals in New Jersey.

With that alone, 35,000 individuals are going to lose their SNAP benefits. That is just on this one part of the bill. Many of them have kids, and the changes are going to affect these kids.

So, if you really care about these kids, I would urge you to reject this bill. Send it back to the Agriculture Committee. Let's work in a bipartisan way and construct a nutrition title which everybody understands, which is clear, which has been vetted, and which we can come to the floor and say with certainty that it will not adversely impact kids. Because this underlying bill, no matter how you want to slice and dice it, will have a negative impact on kids.

□ 1645

And this amendment, you go home and maybe do a press release on it, but it doesn't change the impact of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I regret my friend's confusion over what it does, but, as he well knows, we pass sometimes this much law and those who implement that pass this much, in terms of how it actually gets played out.

This amendment makes it explicitly clear to those who administer the SNAP program that children must be held harmless, they must be protected.

On top of that, the underlying bill also stops family sanctioning.

So you can call it a belt-and-suspenders approach, but, when it comes to children, I think it is worth making it as crystal-clear as possible that they cannot be harmed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Much to the chagrin of many who just oppose any changes to actually help us get children out of poverty and out of the cycle of poverty that perpetual SNAP benefits bring to families, I would argue that it is language like this that reasserts the fact that we need to, as this goes through the legislative process—we are in the second step of the legislative process. As this goes through the process, this clearly shows all of us here in the House and in the Senate and on a conference committee the opportunity that we want to make sure that we protect those who need that protection.

That is exactly why I am glad Mr. MACARTHUR participated in this process. The gentleman wanted to make this bill better. The gentleman wanted to strengthen it to ensure that our children in the most vulnerable households had the opportunity to get the food that they need.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for doing that. I think this is a great addition to the farm bill, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this opportunity to say so.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss. We have no opposition to this amendment, but let's be honest with each other and let's be honest with our constituents. H.R. 2 will hurt families, will hurt working families, will hurt kids.

You know one thing that is also explicit, Mr. Chairman? According to CBO, 265,000 kids will be thrown off of the free breakfast and lunch program. That is according to CBO.

The other thing that is clear is that there are working families—there are working families, Mr. Chairman, people who work, who now get SNAP benefits, who, because we are eliminating broad-based categorical eligibility, a number of them will lose their benefits. And they still work. Their family

households, therefore, will have less of a food allowance. That will impact these kids. That is undeniable.

So don't sit here and say this shows that we are going to protect kids. The law is the law. If you want to restate the law, restate it. Restate it 100 times, "don't hurt kids." That doesn't change the fact that this bill will hurt kids.

That is why so many of us on this side of the aisle and, hopefully, a number of you on your side of the aisle are going to stand strong and oppose this.

This is not right. There was a right way to do this farm bill, and there was a wrong way to do this farm bill. This was the wrong way.

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

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), my friend.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard about broad-based categorical eligibility. If this was a SNAP brochure, Mr. Chairman, and I hand this to you, regardless of what your income is, if you accept this SNAP brochure, you are now eligible for SNAP. That is broad-based categorical eligibility.

Mr. Chairman, if somebody offers you an 800 number to call regarding SNAP, which is a good thing, as is the brochure, and you use that number, under broad-based categorical eligibility, you are now eligible for SNAP, no matter what your income is.

So, if it has been found that some families will come off, it is because it has been found that there are families who already exceed the income.

Now, here is the thing. If they just go and fill out the application, they can be eligible for SNAP if they meet those financial and asset requirements.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, the CBO, the nonpartisan experts that we all rely on, says that over 400,000 households will lose their benefits because of the changes in H.R. 2 with regard to categorical eligibility. We estimate that to be a million people. That is undeniable.

So you can sit here all you want and say this is going to hold everybody harmless and that kids won't suffer. It is just not true. I mean, read the CBO score. Better yet, read the bill.

Look, we have no objection to you passing a restatement of current law, because current law says that, even if parents don't comply, their kids can't

be punished. But make no mistake about it, the overall food allowance in that household will decrease. That is a fact. That will impact those kids.

So, if you truly want to help kids, if you truly care about kids, you will vote "no" on this bill. You will vote "no" on H.R. 2.

You will make sure that this bill goes back to committee, that we have a bipartisan process, and we have a bill that comes to the floor that helps our farmers and that helps those in need in this country.

This is not it. This does not help kids. This amendment does nothing. This is a covering-your-rear-end amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting Chair. The Chair understands that amendment No. 10 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HOLDING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 115-679.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. ____ DISQUALIFICATION OF CERTAIN CONVICTED FELONS.

Section 6 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015), as amended by section 4015, is amended in subsection (p)(1)—

- (1) in subparagraph (A) by striking “: and” at the end and inserting a period, and
- (2) by striking subparagraph (B).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment, and I urge all colleagues to support its inclusion in the farm bill today.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is simple. It ends eligibility for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for convicted rapists, murderers, and those guilty of sexual exploitation.

The 2014 farm bill contained a prohibition for these individuals from being eligible for SNAP, but the individual also has to be considered a fleeing felon. This means that, in order to lose eligibility, the person has to not only be a convicted murderer, rapist, et cetera, but they also must be in violation of the terms of their sentence.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should not have to wait before a criminal who has already been convicted of these acts violates the terms of their sentence before terminating the benefits.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would eliminate the fleeing felon provision from the underlying law and thereby prohibits convicted rapists, pedophiles, murderers, et cetera, from being eligible for SNAP.

This is a commonsense proposal that says if you commit these atrocious crimes that you are ineligible for this government program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this commonsense amendment and include it in the farm bill that we have under consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 115-679.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to H.R. 2 at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. ____ DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF BLOCK GRANT PAYABLE TO PUERTO RICO.

(a) STUDY.—With funds appropriated to carry out this subsection, the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility and impact of using a thrifty food plan developed exclusively to apply under section 19(a)(2)(A)(ii) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028(a)(2)(A)) to calculate the amount of the block grant payable to Puerto Rico.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out subsection (a).

(c) APPROPRIATION IN ADVANCE.—Only funds appropriated under subsection (b) in advance specifically to carry out subsection (a) shall be available to carry out such subsection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 2.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment aims to take a deeper look into the Thrifty Food Plan and how it influences the amount of funds currently calculated for Nutrition Assistance Block Grants provided to Puerto Rico through the Nutrition Assistance Program, NAP.

Puerto Rico is currently included in the Thrifty Food Plan of the 48 contiguous States. However, the island imports most food items that are sold in stores, which increases the cost families pay when purchasing foods included in their diet.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will require the Secretary of Agriculture to produce a report on the feasibility and impact of Puerto Rico having its own Thrifty Food Plan. This will allow the government of Puerto Rico and the Department of Family, which administers the program on the island, to make an educated decision on how to move forward in terms of acquiring benefits and addressing factors that reflect increases in the cost of food items found and purchased on the island.

My second amendment will request the Secretary of Agriculture to produce an update on a 2010 report previously generated by the Food and Nutrition Service Agency at the USDA. That report will indicate the percentage of households that will receive nutritional assistance and what the average monthly benefit per household would be if Puerto Rico were treated equally under the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program, SNAP.

As approved by the 2014 farm bill, Puerto Rico's cash portion of benefits obtained through NAP will gradually be reduced by 5 percent each year until 2021—right now, that measure is waived by this administration because of the hurricane—when all NAP benefits will be then available through the electronic benefit transfer system.

In view of this and in preparation for this, we must start considering if a transition to SNAP is feasible or not and, if so, what it would mean for my constituency in terms of benefits and requirements. An updated study will allow us to have recent data to properly consider making this decision along with the government of Puerto Rico and the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, my amendments essentially seek better facts and better data on the nutritional benefits my constituents receive and depend on. For many families on the island, this is the main source of nutritional assistance.

As Puerto Rico's sole Representative here in Congress, it is my responsibility to make sure that we have the tools and information we need at hand to collaborate with State officials and make those decisions that will continue to help families on the island maintain proper access to a quality diet and, therefore, a proper quality of life.

Mr. Chairman, decisions that are this important and delicate should not be subjected to guesswork but based on updated facts, and my two amendments will do that.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to share that these amendments, as drafted, do not increase mandatory spending.

And, last, I would like to urge my colleagues to support these two amendments, and I want to thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee for helping me out in drafting my amendments and helping the people of Puerto Rico.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. FASO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 115-679.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order by the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. —. ADMINISTRATIVE FLEXIBILITY FOR STATES.

Section 11(e)(6)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)(6)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) personnel of the State agency or, at the option of the State agency and by contract with the State agency, personnel of an entity that has no direct or indirect financial interest in an approved retail food store, may undertake such certification or carry out any other function of the State agency under the supplemental nutrition assistance program and without restriction by the Secretary on the State agency's use of non-governmental employees to perform program eligibility or any other administrative function to carry out such program.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my amendment, which would provide States additional flexibility to administer the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP.

If included in the farm bill, this amendment would provide States the option, not a mandate, to determine the appropriate mix of government staff and service provider staff for all administrative SNAP functions.

It would build on existing SNAP administrator flexibility within employment and training programs as well as technology initiatives like electronic benefits transfer.

This barrier, currently in the SNAP law dating from the 1970s, prevents the implementation of commonsense administrative solutions that include integrated call centers, leveraging investment to modernize programs, and incorporate best practices and the ability to address periodic peaks in enrollment activity that accompany times of economic distress.

□ 1700

Mr. Chairman, I know that at least a dozen Governors sent a letter to the leadership of the House and Senate today saying that States across the country have been calling for administrative flexibility to implement various government programs, and it is time that we provide each State the

choice to decide what is best for them in their overall effectiveness in running these programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank my partners in this amendment, Representatives HARTZLER, POLIQUIN, MARSHALL, and GOODLATTE, who are supportive of this policy change.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this commonsense amendment and provide the States with added flexibility, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. This proposal opens the door to sweeping changes in how States can operate SNAP. The amendment, which was never debated or discussed by the committee, could result in tens of thousands of American jobs being shipped overseas. I know Donald Trump wants to create more jobs in China, but I don't think we do.

This risks good-paying civil service jobs and puts benefits and services to vulnerable households at risk. SNAP's merit system ensures workers' aim is to effectively implement program rules unhindered by private interests or profit motives. Some SNAP operational functions can be appropriately turned over to private contractors, such as computer systems, custodial services, or debit card issuance in order to leverage businesses' competitive advantage.

Some, however, like eligibility determination, must remain a government function. Some SNAP clients, including many elderly, have very complex cases that require trained professional civil service workers to dedicate significant time to appropriately screen and verify their information, and ensure they receive the correct benefit levels, which is important.

Good local jobs likely could be exported out of the area or overseas. In many areas, including rural regions, civil service jobs offer some of the best paying, most stable employment for local workers. Privatizing core SNAP functions would mean many of these jobs would be moved to other locations, including overseas. Why do we want to do that?

Privatization could also compromise the security of a participant's data. SNAP collects detailed information about applicants and participants, including Social Security numbers, household composition and income, and employment information. Handing private data of millions of individuals over to private companies raises serious concerns about their ability to keep it secure, and their interest in using it for other purposes.

I respect the gentleman's intentions, I guess, but I think if we had spent some time in the committee actually discussing this, some of these concerns that I raise would be apparent. So this is a bad idea, a bad amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, in response to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts' comments, I would simply suggest that what this amendment is trying to do is: number one, give the States the option to utilize modern management techniques in terms of the operation of the SNAP program. It is an option. It is not a mandate.

Number two, I would point out that various programs such as TANF, and such as the Children's Health Insurance Program also have the ability to do precisely what I am suggesting in this amendment. This is not unusual. This is not sending jobs overseas. That is an absurd notion, I believe.

The fact of the matter is, we are trying to make it possible for States to seamlessly run these programs, whether it is TANF, whether it is housing assistance, whether it is the Children's Health Insurance Program, or whether it is Medicaid. Those programs, States already have the option and already have the ability to use social service nonprofit organizations like Catholic Charities to assist them in eligibility determinations, to assist States in assisting recipients in getting into employment and training programs.

So what this amendment is seeking to do is to eliminate the exclusion of that ability that is now only in the SNAP program. Mr. Chairman, it is only in the SNAP program that we exclude the opportunity for States to have these kind of abilities, to have these services performed by nonprofit organizations and by other providers that can efficiently and seamlessly coordinate the benefits and eligibility that exists for TANF, that exists for children's health insurance, that exists for a whole panoply of social services programs.

Mr. Chairman, I regret the gentleman from Massachusetts' opposition to the amendment. I hope he would reconsider, given the fact that CHIP and all of these other programs—which the gentleman supports already—permit doing precisely what I am suggesting here, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I am not going to reconsider my opposition. I think this is a bad amendment, plain and simple. And I think the issues like determining eligibility for who can receive SNAP should not be contracted out to some private company. I do worry about creating more jobs overseas and losing very good jobs here at home.

So if you are concerned about keeping good jobs—and these are good jobs, civil service jobs—here in the United States, then you have got to oppose this amendment.

Shifting core SNAP functions to private workers could disrupt timely and accurate benefits. In H.R. 2, we are

going after vulnerable populations in a very, very harsh way, and I think this would complicate things even worse.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Let me very quickly say that my first statement is my opposition to this bill. I can't imagine the cut of \$23 billion out of our food nutrition program, nor can I understand the breaching of the relationship between our support for farmers and our support for poor people.

I appreciate my good friend, Mr. FASO, but I have to stand in strong opposition to his amendment which would authorize States to privatize and contract out program eligibility and other administrative functions.

Mr. Chair, I come from Texas. We tried it. It was an enormous drain on the budget. It didn't work. It was costly. People lost their benefits. It is a terrible idea because removing SNAP's merit staffing requirement would prioritize profit, disrupt access to food assistance, and export good jobs.

The SNAP merit system ensures that an employee's core mission objective is to effectively implement program rules unhindered by private interests or profit motives. Many SNAP clients, including the elderly and disabled, have complex cases that require trained professional civil service workers to dedicate significant time.

When these functions are turned over to for-profit companies, there is a different priority, Mr. Chairman. They focus on the bottom line rather than providing comprehensive support. Your constituents of this program are the elderly and children and disabled. In the early 2000s, Texas transferred most of the operational aspects of its eligibility determination system to a private contractor with disastrous results. Services deteriorated as backlogs and other inefficiencies increased. There were 127,000 children who were dropped from health insurance. I am opposed to this legislation. Let's do what is right, Mr. Chairman, for the children.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to Amendment No. 13 offered by the gentleman from New York, Congressman FASO, which would authorize states to privatize and contract out program eligibility and other administrative functions.

This is a terrible idea because removing SNAP's merit staffing requirement would prioritize profit, disrupt access to food assistance, and export good jobs.

SNAP's merit system ensures that an employee's core mission objective is to effectively implement program rules unhindered by private interests or profit motives.

Many SNAP clients, including the elderly and disabled, have complex cases that require trained, professional civil service workers to dedicate significant time to appropriately screen and verify their information and ensure they receive the correct benefit levels.

When these functions are turned over to for-profit companies, they focus on the bottom line rather than providing comprehensive support to the needy.

This is what we saw in Texas when the state experimented with privatization.

In the early 2000's Texas transferred most of the operational aspects of its eligibility determination system to a private contractor with disastrous results.

Services deteriorated as backlogs and other inefficiencies increased.

The contractor's monthly abandoned call rate was four times higher than what was called for in the contract; more than 127,000 children were dropped from health insurance between December 2005 and April 2006; and thousands of experienced state employees were laid off or quit and replaced by poorly trained, low-paid vendor employees.

Former Texas Comptroller, Carole Keeton Strayhorn, after conducting an audit of the system, stated that the "project has failed the state and the citizens it was designed to serve" and called the privatization effort a "perfect story of wasted tax dollars, reduced access to services and profiteering at taxpayers' expense."

Additionally, the Faso Amendment puts at risk good local jobs that likely could be exported out of the area or overseas.

In many areas, including rural regions, civil service jobs offer some of the best-paying, most stable employment for local workers.

Privatizing core SNAP functions would mean many of these jobs would be moved to other locations, including overseas.

Diminishing the pool of good jobs with steady hours and benefits could leave many out of work or with less stable options, hurting local economies.

An added danger of privatization is that it could compromise the security of participants' data.

SNAP collects detailed information about applicants and participants, including social security numbers, household composition, and income and employment information.

Handing private data of millions of individuals over to private companies raises serious concerns about their ability to keep it secure and their interests in using it for other purposes.

Shifting core SNAP functions to private workers could disrupt timely and accurate provision of benefits.

During the early 2000's, Texas experimented with privatizing key pieces of the eligibility process, including accepting applications, advising clients on program requirements and eligibility, and verifying eligibility.

The results were disastrous.

Thousands were unable to apply or were given misinformation and many received incorrect benefit allotments.

Individuals' private information was released, compromising their security.

And taxpayer dollars were wasted—none of the promises of improved performance or cost-savings were realized.

I urge all Members to join me in voting no to Amendment No. 13.

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

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, to close on the amendment, let me reiterate. This amendment simply seeks to treat States' flexibility for SNAP the same

as it does, as current law does, for TANF, for a host of other social services programs, and for CHIP.

I would also point out, in response to the gentleman from Massachusetts' concern, the States that do this for CHIP and use nonprofit organizations to assist them in eligibility and other determinations, explicitly prohibit the outsourcing of these jobs to foreign countries, and many even prohibit the outsourcing of any job out of State. So the gentleman raises a red herring that is not appropriate in this context, and should not be considered.

This simply gives the States the flexibility to seamlessly manage the SNAP program and coordinate the benefits as they might have for home heating assistance, or they might have for CHIP, or they might have for TANF.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 115-679.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SERVICE OF TRADITIONAL FOODS IN PUBLIC FACILITIES.

Section 4033 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (128 STAT. 818) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting “, a State, a country equivalent, or a local education agency,” after “programs” the 1st place it appears,

(B) by striking “, and facilities operated by tribal organizations, that primarily serve Indians” and inserting “and federally funded child nutrition and senior meal programs,”, and

(2) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) by striking “and” the 1st place it appears, and

(B) by inserting “, a State, a county or county equivalent, a local educational agency, and an entity or person authorized to facilitate the donation, storage, preparation, or serving of traditional food by the operator of a food service program” after “organization”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It is to

make sure Alaska Natives and American Indian populations are able to access traditional foods in nutrition programs.

Many American Indians and Alaska Natives incorporate traditional foods: fish, game, seafood, wild berries, and plants into their daily diets. These foods are locally sourced and culturally significant.

The cultural significance of traditional foods is especially important in long-term care and hospital settings, where individuals are likely to be away from their homes for extended periods and are unable to easily carry on their traditions. It is likewise important for Native youth to have access to traditional foods for proper nutrition and cultural heritage.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, when you are in a hospital you can recover faster if you have a traditional food. This amendment builds on a previous provision of mine in the 2014 farm bill that authorized donation and serving of traditional foods which meet the safety standards and in facilities that serve these indigenous populations.

It applies to programs encompassing residential childcare, child nutrition programs, hospitals, long-term care facilities, and others. There have been no documented safety issues and the food handling and storage safety standards incorporated in my previous amendment are stringent. The standards were, in part, based on successful standards from Alaska which has long led the way for safety procedures for traditional foods.

For years, this provision has led the way to safely offer traditional foods to the vulnerable populations that need it the most. My amendment maintains these standards.

This amendment tonight, like the previous one, has no budgetary effects. That is for those who do not want to spend any more money. It simply works to ensure that Native American and Alaska Native youth and elders can participate in nutrition programs and access traditional foods, regardless of the facility in which the program is implemented.

This is important, given that child nutrition and senior meal programs that serve a significant number of natives are sometimes housed in facilities that are not specifically designated as Tribal, and the legislation is truly focused on the importance of nutrition.

This amendment should be heavily and heartily accepted and passed. I strongly urge adoption of this amendment. It is about nutrition, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, it is with great reluctance that I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. If it were limited to just to Alaska, then that might be one thing, but the underlying language is too broad.

It would allow this to happen across the United States, and I have some concerns about food safety with respect to that.

I understand what he is trying to get at, and I agree with the intent in making that, but I reluctantly disagree, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been to Alaska with Mr. YOUNG a number of times and know the culture up there and what is going on. This is a good amendment. I think it makes a lot of sense for Alaska, and I support it. So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman. Again, I understand why the chairman is against this, but we have no cases where there has been any food hazards, food abuses, or anything like that. And I have to describe one thing to my colleagues.

I am 85 years old. I am an Alaska Native. I have lived in one of the villages up north. My diet has consisted of seal meat, seal oil, whale meat, whale oil, and berries. I am an older man. I am in a hospital in Anchorage, Alaska, or I am in a long-term care facility to take care of me, and they serve me, of all things, a chicken, or they will serve me some salty Spam.

□ 1715

That is not too bad by the way.

But things that will not make me well. And in my mind I desire and my body craves what I have eaten during the history of my life. And that keeps me well. In fact, I might be able to go home and be able to harvest those things that I love.

This is all I am trying to do in facilities. This is a good amendment. I know there has been opposition from some of the Federal agencies: Oh, this is a safety issue. Keep in mind, this is an issue that takes care of that person who is receiving that food.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge a “yes” vote on this legislation. It should happen for those people, my Alaskan Natives. It is important.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have any other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 115-679.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. —. EXTENSION OF STUDY ON COMPARABLE ACCESS TO SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE FOR PUERTO RICO.

(a) **AMENDMENTS.**—Section 4142 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 STAT. 1881) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by striking “this Act” and inserting “Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018”, and

(2) in subsection (d)(1) by striking “2008” and inserting “2018”.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out section 4142 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 STAT. 1881) as amended by subsection (a).

(c) **APPROPRIATION IN ADVANCE.**—Only funds appropriated under subsection (b) in advance specifically to carry out section 4142 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 STAT. 1881) as amended by subsection (a) shall be available to carry out such section as so amended.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, I spoke about the two amendments before, so I am going to be brief now in speaking about this amendment, not without thanking Chairman CONAWAY for helping us out to get this amendment through.

Amendment No. 15 will just request an update on the survey in the request of data for the island. This second amendment requests the Secretary of Agriculture to produce an update on the 2010 report previously generated by the Food and Nutrition Service Agency at the USDA. That report will indicate the percentage of households that will receive nutritional assistance and what the average monthly benefit to their household will be if Puerto Rico were treated equally under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP. We don't receive that.

As approved in the 2014 farm bill, Puerto Rico's cash portion of the benefit obtained through the NAP program will gradually be reduced by 5 percent each year through 2021. Of course, that situation, that 5 percent reduction has been waived since last year by the administration because of the hurricane situation, but all NAP benefits would then be available through the electronic benefit transfer system, the EBT.

In view and in preparation for this, we are beginning to consider the transition to SNAP, if it is feasible or not, and I do think it is feasible. So we are looking forward to having a report that will allow us to know what kind of benefits my constituents will be receiving.

An updated study will allow us to have recent data to properly consider making this decision, along with the Government of Puerto Rico. My amendment will essentially seek better

facts and better data on the nutritional benefits my constituents, the people of Puerto Rico, receive and depend on. For many families on the island, as you may know, this is the main source of nutritional assistance.

I am the only representative of the people of Puerto Rico here and in the Senate, and it is my responsibility to make sure we receive that kind of data. The last time was in 2010. We are in 2018 without an update of that report.

So we look forward to having the tools and information we need at hand to collaborate with State officials and the Federal Government to enable those families to continue to receive those kinds of services and the island to maintain a proper access to a quality diet and, therefore, a proper quality of life. Those decisions need to be made by updated facts and not subjected to guesswork by some officials.

I do believe that this amendment, as drafted, does not increase mandatory spending, so it will require just data. That is what we need.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 115-679.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike page 382, line 8, and all that follows through page 386, line 19, and insert the following:

SEC. 6402. REPEAL OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BIOENERGY SUBSIDY PROGRAMS AND OTHER RELATED SUBSIDY PROGRAMS.

Title IX of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8101 et seq.) is hereby repealed.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. It merely eliminates the bioenergy subsidy programs that were established way back in title IX of the 2002 farm bill some 16 years ago. Those programs are the Biobased Markets Program; the Biorefinery, Renewable Chemical, and Biobased Product Manufacturing Assistance Program; the Repowering Assistance Program; the Biodiesel Fuel Education Program; the Rural Energy for America Program; the Biomass Research and Development Initiative; the Feedstock

Flexibility Program for Bioenergy Producers; the Biomass Crop Assistance Program; and the Community Wood Energy Program.

President Reagan said that there is nothing quite as everlasting as a Federal program, and I am hoping that we can end some of these programs today.

Needless to say, subsidies have no place in a free market. If biofuels are to succeed, it should be based on their benefit to the Nation's overall energy economy, not because they receive taxpayer funds.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to end this Washington giveaway, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his amendment; however, I believe it is a little bit misguided.

The programs that the amendment would eliminate are not energy subsidies. What these programs do is to create infrastructure and market opportunities for America's farmers, ranchers, and rural communities. Furthermore, these programs often leverage private capital that actually works toward revitalizing our communities.

Additionally, while I strongly support the RFS and biofuels production, these programs do not incentivize the production of corn ethanol, do not fund ethanol blender pumps, and are not part of the renewable fuels mandate.

The Biggs amendment strikes infrastructure-focused initiatives that help farmers and ranchers improve energy efficiency in their operations and increase commercial opportunities for agricultural products.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I respect my colleague's reasoned opposition, although I disagree with him.

I appreciate his passion on the issue, and I have no doubt that he and I will work together on many future projects. But with this, Mr. Chairman, I continue to hold my position and would urge the passage of my amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), who is my good friend and colleague.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Biggs amendment as well. This amendment would repeal the bioenergy programs established in the 2002 farm bill. These programs encourage investment in small towns.

Not only do they encourage renewable fuels—and to me, that is a national security issue—but they also

create jobs and investments that bring these benefits to our rural communities, our States, and our country. Not only that, but they also create new demand for many agricultural products.

H.R. 2 already makes reforms. It eliminates mandate funding and reauthorizes programs that reduce discretionary funding levels. This amendment is not necessary because, instead of improving successful programs, it repeals them, eliminating all their successes, while not saving any taxpayer money.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's position, and I regrettably must disagree with that position and continue to urge passage of the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, Mr. BIGGS. It is great to have this opportunity to talk about what we believe the impact of this amendment will be to many of the constituents that I serve in rural America. I appreciate the opportunity to debate. That is what this House is about, and that is what this process is about.

I would like to thank my colleague for offering this amendment, although I do disagree and urge my colleagues to vote against.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-679 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. FOXX of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. FASO of New York.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 137, noes 278, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

AYES—137

Amash
Amodei
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Biggs
Black
Blum
Blumenauer
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Budd
Chabot
Cicilline
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Danny
Delaney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garamendi
Garrett
Goslatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffith
Gutiérrez
Handel

Harris
Heck
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Lance
Langevin
Latta
Lee
Lesko
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Marino
Massie
Mast
McClintock
Meeks
Messer
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Pallone
Pascrell
Perry
Peters
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe

Reichert
Renacci
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rosen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Sanford
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Upton
Veasey
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Welch
Wenstrup
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

NOES—278

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Burgess

Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Correa

Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Dunn

Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallo
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)

Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Loebach
Loftgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meng
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price (NC)

Reed
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Soto
Stefanik
Suozi
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Walden
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Beyer
Blackburn
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)

Buck
Clay
Gohmert
Labrador
Meadows

□ 1753

Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. HERERA BEUTLER, Messrs. CAPUANO, ADERHOLT, and LONG changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LEE, Messrs. PASCRELL and ISSA changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on

which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 34, noes 380, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

AYES—34

Amash	Garrett	Mooney (WV)
Banks (IN)	Gosar	Perry
Biggs	Hensarling	Posey
Budd	Herrera Beutler	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Issa	Rooney, Francis
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cook	Lance	Royce (CA)
DeSantis	Lesko	Sanford
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Schwepker
Fox	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Frelinghuysen	McClintock	
Gaetz	Messer	

NOES—380

Abraham	Comstock	Gibbs
Adams	Conaway	Gomez
Aderholt	Connolly	Gonzalez (TX)
Aguilar	Cooper	Goodlatte
Allen	Correa	Gottheimer
Amodei	Costa	Gowdy
Arrington	Costello (PA)	Granger
Babin	Courtney	Graves (GA)
Bacon	Cramer	Graves (LA)
Barletta	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Barr	Crist	Green, Al
Barragán	Crowley	Green, Gene
Barton	Cuellar	Griffith
Bass	Culberson	Grijalva
Beatty	Cummings	Grothman
Bera	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Bergman	Curtis	Gutiérrez
Bilirakis	Davidson	Hanabusa
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Handel
Bishop (MI)	Davis, Danny	Harper
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Black	DeFazio	Hartzler
Blum	DeGette	Hastings
Blumenauer	Delaney	Heck
Blunt Rochester	DeLauro	Hice, Jody B.
Bonamici	DelBene	Higgins (LA)
Bost	Demings	Higgins (NY)
Brady (PA)	Denham	Hill
Brady (TX)	DeSaulnier	Himes
Brat	DesJarlais	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Deutch	Hollingsworth
Brooks (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Hudson
Buchanan	Doggett	Huffman
Bucshon	Donovan	Huizenga
Burgess	Doyle, Michael	Hultgren
Bustos	F.	Hunter
Butterfield	Duffy	Hurd
Byrne	Duncan (SC)	Jackson Lee
Calvert	Dunn	Jayapal
Capuano	Ellison	Jeffries
Carbajal	Emmer	Jenkins (KS)
Cárdenas	Engel	Jenkins (WV)
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Carter (GA)	Españillat	Johnson (LA)
Carter (TX)	Estes (KS)	Johnson (OH)
Cartwright	Esty (CT)	Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL)	Evans	Jones
Castro (TX)	Faso	Jordan
Cheney	Ferguson	Joyce (OH)
Chu, Judy	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Ciçilline	Fleischmann	Katko
Clark (MA)	Flores	Keating
Clarke (NY)	Fortenberry	Kelly (IL)
Cleaver	Foster	Kelly (MS)
Clyburn	Frankel (FL)	Kelly (PA)
Cohen	Fudge	Kennedy
Cole	Gabbard	Khanna
Collins (GA)	Gallagher	Kihuen
Collins (NY)	Garamendi	Kildee
Comer	Gianforte	Kilmer

Kind	Newhouse	Sherman
King (IA)	Noem	Shimkus
King (NY)	Nolan	Shuster
Kinziger	Norcross	Simpson
Knight	Norman	Sinema
Krishnamoorthi	Nunes	Sires
Kuster (NH)	O'Halleran	Smith (MO)
Kustoff (TN)	O'Rourke	Smith (NE)
LaHood	Olson	Smith (NJ)
LaMalfa	Palazzo	Smith (TX)
Lamb	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Lamborn	Palmer	Smucker
Langevin	Panetta	Soto
Larsen (WA)	Pascrell	Speier
Larson (CT)	Paulsen	Stefanik
Latta	Payne	Stewart
Lawrence	Pearce	Stivers
Lawson (FL)	Pelosi	Suozzi
Lee	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Levin	Peters	Takano
Lewis (GA)	Peterson	Taylor
Lewis (MN)	Pingree	Tenney
Lieu, Ted	Pittenger	Thompson (CA)
Lipinski	Pocan	Thompson (MS)
Loeb	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Loeb	Poliquin	Thornberry
Long	Price (NC)	Tipton
Love	Quigley	Titus
Lowenthal	Raskin	Tonko
Lowe	Ratcliffe	Torres
Lucas	Reed	Trott
Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Tsongas
Lujan Grisham,	Renacci	Turner
M.	Rice (NY)	Upton
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rice (SC)	Valadao
Lynch	Richmond	Vargas
MacArthur	Roby	Veasey
Maloney,	Roe (TN)	Vela
Carolyn B.	Rogers (AL)	Velázquez
Maloney, Sean	Rokita	Visclosky
Marchant	Rooney, Thomas	Wagner
Marino	J.	Walberg
Marshall	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
Massie	Rosen	Walker
Mast	Roskam	Walorski
Costa	Ross	Walters, Mimi
Granger	Rouzer	Wasserman
Graves (GA)	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
Graves (LA)	Ruiz	Waters, Maxine
Graves (MO)	Ruppersberger	Watson Coleman
Green, Al	Rush	Weber (TX)
Green, Gene	Russell	Webster (FL)
Griffith	Rutherford	Welch
Grijalva	Ryan (OH)	Wenstrup
Grothman	Sánchez	Westerman
Guthrie	Sarbanes	Williams
Gutiérrez	Scalise	Wilson (FL)
Hanabusa	Schakowsky	Wilson (SC)
Handel	Schiff	Wittman
Harper	Schneider	Womack
Harris	Schrader	Woodall
Hartzler	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth
Hastings	Scott, Austin	Yoder
Heck	Scott, David	Yoho
Hice, Jody B.	Serrano	Young (AK)
Higgins (LA)	Sessions	Young (IA)
Higgins (NY)	Sewell (AL)	Zeldin
Hill	Shea-Porter	
Himes		
Holding		
Hollingsworth		
Hoyer		
Hudson		
Huffman		
Huizenga		
Hultgren		
Hunter		
Hurd		
Jackson Lee		
Jayapal		
Jeffries		
Jenkins (KS)		
Jenkins (WV)		
Johnson (GA)		
Johnson (LA)		
Johnson (OH)		
Johnson, E. B.		
Jones		
Jordan		
Joyce (OH)		
Kaptur		
Katko		
Keating		
Kelly (IL)		
Kelly (MS)		
Kelly (PA)		
Kennedy		
Khanna		
Kihuen		
Kildee		
Kilmer		

NOT VOTING—13

Beyer	Buck	Meadows
Blackburn	Clay	Polis
Boyle, Brendan	Galleo	Rogers (KY)
F.	Gohmert	Walz
Brown (MD)	Labrador	

□ 1758

Mr. COFFMAN changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 83, noes 330, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

AYES—83

Aderholt	Fleischmann	Messer
Arrington	Fox	Mooney (WV)
Bacon	Gaetz	Norman
Banks (IN)	Gallagher	Palazzo
Barr	Garrett	Palmer
Biggs	Gosar	Perry
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Pittenger
Black	Graves (LA)	Poe (TX)
Blum	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Brat	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Budd	Harris	Roby
Byrne	Hensarling	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Hice, Jody B.	Rokita
Carter (GA)	Holding	Rooney, Francis
Chabot	Huizenga	Rouzer
Cheney	Hunter	Russell
Collins (GA)	Issa	Sanford
Comer	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Schweikert
Curtis	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Davidson	King (IA)	Smucker
DeSantis	Kustoff (TN)	Walker
DesJarlais	LaHood	Westerman
Duffy	Lamborn	Williams
Duncan (SC)	Lesko	Wittman
Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Woodall
Estes (KS)	Mast	Zeldin
Ferguson	McClintock	

NOES—330

Abraham	Costa	Granger
Adams	Costello (PA)	Graves (MO)
Aguilar	Courtney	Green, Al
Allen	Cramer	Green, Gene
Amash	Crawford	Griffith
Amodei	Crist	Grijalva
Babin	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Barletta	Cuellar	Hanabusa
Barragán	Culberson	Handel
Barton	Cummings	Harper
Bass	Curbelo (FL)	Hartzler
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Hastings
Bera	Davis, Danny	Heck
Bergman	Davis, Rodney	Herrera Beutler
Bilirakis	DeFazio	Higgins (LA)
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Higgins (NY)
Bishop (MI)	Delaney	Hill
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Himes
Blunt Rochester	DelBene	Hollingsworth
Bonamici	Demings	Hoyer
Bost	Denham	Hudson
Brady (PA)	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Brady (TX)	Deutch	Hultgren
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Hurd
Brooks (IN)	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Jayapal
Buchanan	Donovan	Jeffries
Bucshon	Doyle, Michael	Jenkins (KS)
Burgess	F.	Jenkins (WV)
Bustos	Dunn	Johnson (GA)
Butterfield	Ellison	Johnson (OH)
Capuano	Emmer	Johnson, E. B.
Carbajal	Engel	Jones
Cárdenas	Españillat	Joyce (OH)
Carson (IN)	Esty (CT)	Kaptur
Carter (TX)	Evans	Katko
Cartwright	Faso	Keating
Castor (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX)	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Chu, Judy	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Ciçilline	Foster	Kennedy
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	Khanna
Clarke (NY)	Frelinghuysen	Kihuen
Cleaver	Fudge	Kildee
Clyburn	Gabbard	Kilmer
Cohen	Galleo	Kind
Cole	Garamendi	King (NY)
Collins (GA)	Gianforte	Kinzinger
Collins (NY)	Gibbs	Knight
Comer	Gomez	Krishnamoorthi
	Gonzalez (TX)	Kuster (NH)
	Goodlatte	LaMalfa
	Gottheimer	Lamb
	Gowdy	Lance

Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem

NOT VOTING—14

Beyer
Blackburn
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)

Buck
Clay
Eshoo
Gohmert
Labrador

Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Paulsen
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suo zzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

□ 1802

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. FASO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 192, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

AYES—222

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Sanford
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McFerguson
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson

NOES—192

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Brady (PA)

Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Galego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen

NOT VOTING—13

Beyer
Blackburn
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)

Buck
Clay
Gohmert
Green, Gene
Labrador

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1806

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 75, noes 340, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

AYES—75

Amash	Gallagher	Norman
Banks (IN)	Garrett	Palmer
Biggs	Gianforte	Poe (TX)
Bilirakis	Gosar	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Ratcliffe
Brat	Grothman	Roe (TN)
Budd	Harris	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Hartzler	Rokita
Carter (GA)	Hensarling	Rooney, Francis
Chabot	Hice, Jody B.	Rothfus
Coffman	Holding	Royce (CA)
Collins (GA)	Huizenga	Russell
Comer	Hunter	Sanford
Cooper	Issa	Scalise
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Schweikert
Curtis	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Davidson	Lamborn	Sessions
DeSantis	Lesko	Wagner
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Walker
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Walters, Mimi
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Estes (KS)	McHenry	Williams
Fleischmann	McSally	Williams
Foxx	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Zeldin

NOES—340

Abraham	Crowley	Higgins (NY)
Adams	Cuellar	Hill
Aderholt	Cummings	Himes
Aguilar	Curbelo (FL)	Hollingsworth
Allen	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Amodei	Davis, Danny	Hudson
Arrington	Davis, Rodney	Huffman
Babin	DeFazio	Hultgren
Bacon	DeGette	Hurd
Barletta	Delaney	Jackson Lee
Barr	DeLauro	Jayapal
Barragán	DelBene	Jeffries
Barton	Demings	Jenkins (KS)
Bass	Denham	Jenkins (WV)
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Johnson (GA)
Bera	Deutch	Johnson (LA)
Bergman	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (MI)	Doggett	Jones
Black	Donovan	Joyce (OH)
Blum	Doyle, Michael	Kaptur
Blumenauer	F.	Katko
Blunt Rochester	Duffy	Keating
Bonamici	Dunn	Kelly (IL)
Bost	Ellison	Kelly (MS)
Brady (PA)	Emmer	Kelly (PA)
Brady (TX)	Engel	Kennedy
Brooks (AL)	Eshoo	Khanna
Brooks (IN)	Espallat	Kihuen
Brownley (CA)	Esty (CT)	Kildee
Buchanan	Evans	Kilmer
Bucshon	Faso	Kind
Bustos	Ferguson	King (IA)
Butterfield	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Byrne	Flores	Kinzinger
Calvert	Fortenberry	Knight
Capuano	Foster	Krishnamoorthi
Carbajal	Frankel (FL)	Kuster (NH)
Cárdenas	Fudge	Kustoff (TN)
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	LaHood
Carter (TX)	Gaetz	LaMalfa
Cartwright	Gallego	Lamb
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	Lance
Castro (TX)	Gibbs	Langevin
Cheney	Gomez	Larsen (WA)
Chu, Judy	Gonzalez (TX)	Larson (CT)
Cicilline	Goodlatte	Latta
Clark (MA)	Gottheimer	Lawrence
Clarke (NY)	Gowdy	Lawson (FL)
Cleaver	Granger	Lee
Clyburn	Graves (LA)	Levin
Cohen	Graves (MO)	Lewis (GA)
Cole	Green, Al	Lewis (MN)
Collins (NY)	Green, Gene	Lieu, Ted
Comstock	Griffith	Lipinski
Conaway	Grijalva	LoBiondo
Connolly	Guthrie	Loeb
Cook	Gutiérrez	Lofgren
Correa	Hanabusa	Long
Costa	Handel	Love
Costello (PA)	Harper	Lowenthal
Courtney	Hastings	Lowe
Cramer	Heck	Lucas
Crawford	Herrera Beutler	Luetkemeyer
Crist	Higgins (LA)	

Lujan Grisham, M.	Peters	Smith (TX)
Luján, Ben Ray	Peterson	Smith (WA)
Lynch	Pingree	Smucker
MacArthur	Pittenger	Soto
Maloney,	Pocan	Speier
Carolyn B.	Poliquin	Stefanik
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Stewart
Marchant	Quigley	Stivers
Marino	Raskin	Suozzi
Marshall	Reed	Swalwell (CA)
Mast	Reichert	Takano
Matsui	Renacci	Taylor
McCarthy	Rice (NY)	Tenney
McCaul	Rice (SC)	Thompson (CA)
McCollum	Richmond	Thompson (MS)
McEachin	Roby	Thompson (PA)
McGovern	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
McKinley	Rooney, Thomas J.	Tipton
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus
Rodgers	Rosen	Tonko
McNerney	Roskam	Torres
Meeks	Ross	Trott
Meng	Rouzer	Tsongas
Messer	Roybal-Allard	Turner
Mitchell	Ruiz	Upton
Mooleenaar	Ruppersberger	Valadao
Moore	Rush	Vargas
Moulton	Rutherford	Veasey
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Vela
Nadler	Sánchez	Velázquez
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Neal	Schakowsky	Walberg
Newhouse	Schiff	Walden
Noem	Schneider	Walorski
Nolan	Schrader	Wasserman
Norcross	Scott (VA)	Schultz
Nunes	Scott, Austin	Waters, Maxine
O'Halleran	Scott, David	Watson Coleman
O'Rourke	Serrano	Weber (TX)
Olson	Sewell (AL)	Welch
Palazzo	Shea-Porter	Wenstrup
Pallone	Sherman	Westerman
Panetta	Shinkus	Wilson (FL)
Pascarell	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Paulsen	Simpson	Womack
Payne	Sinema	Yarmuth
Pearce	Sires	Yoder
Pelosi	Smith (MO)	Yoho
Perlmutter	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)
Perry	Smith (NJ)	Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—12

Beyer	Buck	Polis
Blackburn	Clay	Rogers (KY)
Boyle, Brendan	Gohmert	Walz
F.	Labrador	
Brown (MD)	Meadows	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1811

Mr. COFFMAN changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.
The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

**AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION
ACT OF 2018**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 891 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1813

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 20 printed in part C of House Report 115-677 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part C of House Report 115-677 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. WESTERMAN of Arkansas.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 191, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

AYES—224

Abraham	Black	Coffman
Aderholt	Blum	Cole
Allen	Bost	Collins (GA)
Amash	Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)
Amodei	Brat	Comer
Arrington	Brooks (AL)	Comstock
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Bacon	Buchanan	Cook
Banks (IN)	Bucshon	Cramer
Barletta	Budd	Crawford
Barr	Burgess	Culberson
Barton	Byrne	Curtis
Bergman	Calvert	Davidson
Biggs	Carter (GA)	Davis, Rodney
Bilirakis	Carter (TX)	Denham
Bishop (MI)	Chabot	DeSantis
Bishop (UT)	Cheney	DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Rooney, Francis	Lujan Grisham,	Pelosi	Sinema	Gianforte	Long	Roskam
Donovan	Kinzinger	Rooney, Thomas	M.	Perlmutter	Sires	Gibbs	Loudermilk	Ross
Duffy	Knight	J.	Luján, Ben Ray	Peters	Smith (NJ)	Goodlatte	Love	Rothfus
Duncan (SC)	Kustoff (TN)	Roskam	Lynch	Pingree	Smith (WA)	Gosar	Lucas	Rouzer
Duncan (TN)	LaHood	Ross	Maloney,	Pocan	Soto	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer	Royce (CA)
Dunn	LaMalfa	Rothfus	Carolyn B.	Price (NC)	Speier	Granger	MacArthur	Russell
Emmer	Lamborn	Rouzer	Maloney, Sean	Quigley	Stefanik	Graves (GA)	Marchant	Rutherford
Estes (KS)	Latta	Royce (CA)	Matsui	Raskin	Suozi	Graves (LA)	Marino	Scalise
Faso	Lesko	Russell	McCollum	Rice (NY)	Swalwell (CA)	Graves (MO)	Marshall	Schweikert
Ferguson	Lewis (MN)	Rutherford	McEachin	Richmond	Takano	Griffith	Masie	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	Long	Sanford	McGovern	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)	Grothman	Mast	Sensenbrenner
Flores	Loudermilk	Scalise	McNerney	Rosen	Thompson (MS)	Guthrie	McCarthy	Sessions
Fortenberry	Love	Schrader	Meeks	Roybal-Allard	Tonko	Handel	McCaul	Shimkus
Fox	Lucas	Schweikert	Meng	Ruiz	Torres	Harper	McClintock	Shuster
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin	Moore	Ruppersberger	Tsongas	Harris	McHenry	Simpson
Gaetz	MacArthur	Sensenbrenner	Moulton	Rush	Vargas	Hartzler	McKinley	Smith (MO)
Gallagher	Marchant	Sessions	Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Veasey	Hensarling	McMorris	Smith (NE)
Garrett	Marino	Shimkus	Nadler	Sánchez	Velázquez	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Gianforte	Marshall	Shuster	Napolitano	Sarbanes	Visclosky	Hice, Jody B.	McSally	Smucker
Gibbs	Massie	Simpson	Neal	Schakowsky	Wasserman	Higgins (LA)	Meadows	Stewart
Goodlatte	Mast	Smith (MO)	Nolan	Schiff	Schultz	Holding	Messer	Stivers
Gosar	McCarthy	Smith (NE)	Norcross	Schneider	Waters, Maxine	Hollingsworth	Mitchell	Taylor
Gowdy	McCaul	Smith (TX)	O'Halleran	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman	Hudson	Mooleenaar	Tenney
Granger	McClintock	Smucker	O'Rourke	Scott, David	Welch	Huizenga	Mooney (WV)	Thompson (PA)
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Stewart	Pallone	Serrano	Wilson (FL)	Hultgren	Mullin	Thornberry
Graves (LA)	McKinley	Stivers	Panetta	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth	Hunter	Newhouse	Tipton
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Taylor	Pascrell	Shea-Porter		Hurd	Noem	Trott
Griffith	Rodgers	Tenney	Payne	Sherman		Issa	Norman	Turner
Grothman	McSally	Thompson (PA)				Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Valadao
Guthrie	Messer	Thornberry	Beyer	Buck	Polis	Jenkins (OH)	Olson	Wagner
Handel	Mitchell	Tipton	Blackburn	Clay	Rogers (KY)	Johnson (WV)	Palazzo	Walberg
Harper	Moolenaar	Titus	Boyle, Brendan	Gohmert	Walz	Johnson, Sam	Palmer	Walden
Harris	Mooney (WV)	Trott	F.	Labrador		Jones	Pearce	Walker
Hartzler	Mullin	Turner	Brown (MD)	Meadows		Jordan	Perry	Walorski
Hensarling	Newhouse	Upton				Joyce (OH)	Peterson	Walters, Mimi
Herrera Beutler	Noem	Valadao				Kaptur	Pittenger	Weber (TX)
Hice, Jody B.	Norman	Vela				Katko	Poe (TX)	Webster (FL)
Higgins (LA)	Nunes	Wagner				Kelly (MS)	Poliquin	Wenstrup
Hill	Olson	Walberg				Kelly (PA)	Posey	Westerman
Holding	Palazzo	Walden				King (NY)	Ratcliffe	Williams
Hollingsworth	Palmer	Walker				Kinzinger	Reed	Wilson (SC)
Hudson	Paulsen	Walorski				Knight	Renacci	Wittman
Huizenga	Pearce	Walters, Mimi				Kustoff (TN)	Rice (SC)	Womack
Hultgren	Perry	Weber (TX)				LaHood	Roby	Woodall
Hunter	Peterson	Webster (FL)				LaMalfa	Roe (TN)	Yoder
Hurd	Pittenger	Wenstrup				Lamborn	Rohrabacher	Yoho
Issa	Poe (TX)	Westernman				Latta	Rokita	Young (AK)
Jenkins (KS)	Poliquin	Williams				Lesko	Rooney, Thomas J.	Young (IA)
Jenkins (WV)	Posey	Wilson (SC)				Lewis (MN)		Zeldin
Johnson (LA)	Ratcliffe	Wittman						
Johnson (OH)	Reed	Womack						
Johnson, Sam	Reichert	Woodall						
Jones	Renacci	Yoder						
Jordan	Rice (SC)	Yoho						
Joyce (OH)	Roby	Young (AK)						
Katko	Roe (TN)	Young (IA)						
Kelly (MS)	Rogers (AL)	Zeldin						
Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher							
King (IA)	Rokita							

Pallone	Rush	Swalwell (CA)
Panetta	Ryan (OH)	Takano
Pascarell	Sánchez	Thompson (CA)
Paulsen	Sanford	Thompson (MS)
Payne	Sarbanes	Titus
Pelosi	Schakowsky	Tonko
Perlmutter	Schiff	Torres
Peters	Schneider	Tsongas
Pingree	Schrader	Upton
Pocan	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Price (NC)	Scott, David	Veasey
Quigley	Serrano	Vela
Raskin	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Reichert	Shea-Porter	Visclosky
Rice (NY)	Sherman	Wasserman
Richmond	Sinema	Schultz
Rogers (AL)	Sires	Waters, Maxine
Rooney, Francis	Smith (NJ)	Watson Coleman
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Welch
Rosen	Soto	Wilson (FL)
Roybal-Allard	Speler	Yarmuth
Ruiz	Stefanik	
Ruppersberger	Suozzi	

NOT VOTING—12

Beyer	Buck	Polis
Blackburn	Clay	Rogers (KY)
Boyle, Brendan	Gohmert	Walz
F.	Labrador	
Brown (MD)	Napolitano	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1829

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments under House Resolution 891, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 900 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1832

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today,

amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 115-679 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. RUSSELL

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GALLAGHER). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 115-679.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 386, line 23, insert “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “Section”.

Page 387, after line 5, insert the following:
(b) EXCLUSION OF ALCOHOL PRODUCTS FROM DEFINITION.—Section 231(a)(5) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1632a(a)(5)) is amended by adding below subparagraph (B) the following:

“The term ‘value-added agricultural product’ does not include beer, wine, distilled spirits, hard cider, or other alcohol product.”

(c) RESCISSION.—Of the funds made available under section 231(b)(7)(A) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (as in effect before the date of the enactment of this section) to the Secretary of Agriculture to make value-added agricultural product market development grants and unobligated as of such date of enactment, \$8,000,000 is hereby rescinded.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment addresses but redirects; it does not eliminate any funds from the Value Added Producer Grants.

These \$18 million worth of grants are designed to generate new products, expand market opportunities, and assist beginning and socially disadvantaged farmers, family farms, and even veterans entering farming.

Unfortunately, millions of these funds go to fund alcohol products.

While there is nothing inherently wrong with alcohol products, of the government funds that are used for promotion of these products through the program, we also note that the alcohol industry spends \$7.6 million a year in lobbying costs.

Not only do these tax dollars used to fund the promotion of alcohol take away from non-alcohol-based farmers and ranchers, they also compete with the Government itself.

Every year, we spend millions of dollars to curtail the use and abuse of alcohol.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, the impacts and loss of alcohol abuse results in \$249 billion a year in economic, workplace absence, healthcare loss, criminal justice expenses, and vehicle crash costs.

Mr. Chairman, it makes no sense that the Government should spend money to both promote and curtail an industry.

This amendment preserves the Value Added Grants for farmers that have no

\$8-million-a-year industry to lobby for them, and it ends the duplicitous practice of the Government being both for and against something that costs the Nation nearly \$250 billion in annual economic loss.

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

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

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Russell amendment, which, if enacted, would have a detrimental impact on producers across our Nation, including many of my wine, grape, and hops producers, as well as the beer and wine industry, not only in my State, but around the country.

This amendment proposes to eliminate wine, distilled spirits, beer, and other alcohol products from the Value Added Producer Grant program administered by the USDA.

These industries, in my State and, quite frankly, across the Nation, are a growing segment of our farm economy, providing thousands of jobs.

It is also important to point out the growing significance of wine and hops exports to their industries. Last year, my State exported \$28 million of wine, representing about 5 percent of our total production.

In my home valley of the Yakima Valley in the State of Washington, we account for 75 percent of the U.S. production of hops. With the continued boom of microbreweries and the demand for hops, we must ensure we have available markets.

Our wine grape growers and the wine industry continue to face challenges in export markets, such as the recent tariffs placed on our products by China.

We are in an environment with potential changes in international trade, and farmers are looking for more export markets.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose any efforts to limit our farmers' ability to find markets for their products.

Mr. Chair, I include these letters of support in the RECORD: one from the Wine Institute, Wine America, Distilled Spirits Council, and the Brewers Association; and one from the Specialty Crop Farm Bill Alliance.

MAY 17, 2018.

Re Oppose Russell Amendment to the Farm Bill.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write on behalf of the nearly 9,000 small, family owned wineries, 6,200 small and independent breweries and approximately 1,700 distilleries spread across rural America to urge you to vote against the Russell Amendment to the Farm Bill.

This amendment would unfairly target a vibrant and growing segment of U.S. agriculture by seeking to block small wineries, breweries and distilleries from participating in USDA's value-added agriculture marketing grants. Combined, the American

wine, brewing and spirits industries have a direct economic impact of \$287 billion on the United States economy and support more than 5 million jobs nationwide.

Wineries, distilleries and breweries in America represent the very epitome of value-added agriculture, bringing quality jobs and generating much needed tourism to farming communities across the country. This amendment would make it harder for these communities to benefit fully from this opportunity.

We urge you to support these small businesses and their communities buy opposing the Russell Amendment.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. KOCH,
President & CEO,
Wine Institute.

JAMES TREZISE,
President,
WineAmerica.

ROBERT D. PEASE,
President & CEO,
Brewers Association.

MARK GORMAN,
SVP Government Relations,
Distilled Spirits Council.

SCFBA,

Washington, DC, May 16, 2018.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The Specialty Crop Farm Bill Alliance representing over 120 specialty crop organizations across the United States appreciate Chairman Conaway's efforts on H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act that initiates the formal 2018 Farm Bill process and for his diligent efforts to complete Committee action on the measure and get it to the floor of the House. After a thorough review of the H.R. 2, the Alliance is also pleased to see that the Committee has retained many of the specialty crop provisions that were included in the 2014 Farm Bill. Included in the House version are provisions funding key specialty crop priorities such as:

Specialty Crop Block Grants (\$85 million/year);

Specialty Crop Research Initiative (\$80 million/year);

Trade Programs including MAP (\$200 million/year) and TASC (\$9 Million/year);

Pest and Disease Programs (\$75 million/year) and National Clean Plant Network (\$5 million/year);

Food Insecurity and Nutrition Incentive Program (FINI) (Increased to \$285 million over five years).

These funding commitments demonstrate that the House recognizes the value of these programs and their tremendous importance to the specialty crop industry and the Alliance is grateful for their inclusion in the House legislation. With debate over the next several days on a series of amendments to H.R. 2, we would like to draw your attention to several amendments we interested in. In particular the Specialty Crop Farm Bill Alliance opposes the following amendments:

Amendment 50 by Rep. Russell prohibits USDA value-added grants for wine and other products;

Amendment 71 by Reps. Brat, Blumenauer, and Titus on Checkoff Programs;

Amendment 93 by Rep McClintock on Crop Insurance;

Amendment 97 by Rep. Faso on Plant Pests;

Amendment 100 by Rep. Rogers on multi-vitamin purchases through SNAP.

Finally, we look forward to continuing to work with Chairman Conaway and Members of the House Agriculture Committee on further policy objectives that we believe will strengthen this bill and assist the specialty crop industry to compete in a domestic and

global market place. These priorities are consistent with our requests since last year and in previous Farm Bills which include enhancing nutrition programs, continuing to support Specialty Crop Block Grant programs, combatting invasive pest and diseases, support trade programs, and research funding.

We look forward to the Farm Bill being considered on the House floor this week and that you will strongly consider our views on the amendments mentioned above.

Thank you,

JOHN KEELING,
Executive Vice President & CEO,
National Potato Council,
SCFBA Steering Committee Co-Chair.

MIKE STUART,
President & CEO,
Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association,
SCFBA Steering Committee Co-Chair.

TOM NASSIF,
President,
Western Growers Association,
SCFBA Steering Committee Co-Chair.

ROBERT GUENTHER,
Sr. Vice President of Public Policy,
United Fresh Produce Association,
SCFBA Steering Committee Secretariat.

Attachment: List of Specialty Crop Coalition Members.

SPECIALTY CROP FARM BILL ALLIANCE ORGANIZATION

SPECIALTY CROP FARM BILL ALLIANCE STEERING COMMITTEE

Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, Co-Chair; National Potato Council, Co-Chair; Western Growers Association, Co-Chair; United Fresh Produce Association, Executive Secretariat; American Mushroom Institute; American Mushroom Institute; AmericanHort; America Pistachio Association; Blue Diamond Growers; California Association of Winegrape Growers; California Citrus Mutual; California Fresh Fruit Association; California Table Grape Commission; Florida Tomato Exchange; Georgia Fruit & Vegetable Growers Association.

Idaho Grower Shippers Association; Idaho Potato Commission; National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; National Watermelon Association; National Grape Research Alliance; Northwest Horticultural Council; Produce Marketing Association; Sunkist Growers; Sun-Maid Growers; Texas International Produce Association; U.S. Apple Association; Washington State Potato Commission; Wild Blueberry Commission of Maine.

SPECIALTY CROP FARM BILL ALLIANCE MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

Alabama Watermelon Association; Arizona Winegrowers Association; Buy California Marketing Agreement; California Association of Nurseries & Garden Centers; California Canning Peach Association; California Dried Plum Board; California Fig Institute; California Fresh Fig Growers Association; California Strawberry Commission; California Walnut Commission; California-Arizona Watermelon Association; Cherry Marketing Institute; Colorado Potato Administrative Committee; Colorado Wine Industry Development Board.

Connecticut Farm Wine Development Council; Connecticut Vineyard & Winery Association; Empire State Potato Growers;

Florida Citrus Mutual; Florida Citrus Packers; Florida Strawberry Growers Association; Florida Sweet Corn Exchange; Florida Watermelon Association; Fruit Growers Marketing Association; Georgia Watermelon Association; Grower-Shipper Association of Central California; Idaho Grape Growers and Wine Producers Commission; Indian River Citrus League; Indiana-Illinois Watermelon Association.

Leafy Greens Council; Maine Potato Board; Maryland-Delaware Watermelon Association; Maryland Wineries Association; Miami-Dade County; Michigan Apple Committee; Minnesota Area II Potato Growers Research and Promotion Council; Minnesota Grape Growers Association; Missouri Wine & Grape Board; National Berry Crop Initiative; National Grape Cooperative Association; National Onion Association; National Peach Council; New England Vegetable and Berry Growers.

New Mexico Wine Growers Association; New York Apple Association; New York Wine & Grape Foundation; North American Blueberry Council; North American Bramble Growers Association; North American Strawberry Growers Association; North Carolina Blueberry Council; North Carolina Grape & Wine Council; North Carolina Potato Association; North Carolina Strawberry Association; North Carolina Watermelon Association; Northern Kentucky Vintners & Grape Growers Association; Northern Plains Potato Growers.

Ocean Spray Cranberries, Inc.; Ohio Wine Producers Association; Oklahoma Grape Growers & Wine Makers Association; Oregon Potato Commission; Oregon Raspberry & Blackberry Commission; Oregon Strawberry Commission; Oregon Wine Advocacy Council; Oregon Winegrowers Association; Peace River Valley Citrus Growers Association; Peerbolt Crop Management; Potato Growers of Idaho; Rocky Mountain Association of Vintners & Viticulturists.

South Carolina Watermelon Association; Tennessee Farm Winegrowers Association; Texas Citrus Mutual; Texas Vegetable Association; Texas Wine & Grape Growers Association; Texas Watermelon Association; Tropical Fruit Growers of South Florida; United Fresh Potato Growers of Idaho; United Potato Growers of America; Virginia Apple Growers Association; Virginia Wineries Association; Washington Association of Wine Grape Growers; Washington Red Raspberry Commission.

Washington State Apple Commission; Welch's; Western Pistachio Association; Western Watermelon Association; Wine Institute; Wine Producers Commission; WineAmerica; Winegrape Growers of America; Winegrowers Association of Georgia; WineMichigan; Wyoming Grape & Wine Association; Yakima Valley Growers-Shippers Association.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, we should not be singling out key agricultural industries under programs like this. We should not be picking winners and losers among our farmers.

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

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Washington State for yielding me the time and for speaking against this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I am sorry to say to my colleague from the other side of the aisle, we oppose this amendment,

which would remove money from the highly successful Value Added Producer Grant program.

The base text of this farm bill already removes all mandatory funding from VAPG. Now this amendment would make a bad situation worse by rescinding \$8 million from VAPG.

The Value Added Producer Grant is one of the only grant programs that goes directly to farmers.

At a time when the farm economy is hurting, we should be helping farmers find new markets, not taking away opportunities to do so.

USDA's Economic Research Service released a new report earlier this month. Businesses that receive VAPG support are less likely to fail than non-recipient businesses, and businesses that receive VAPG support also employ more workers than nonrecipient businesses.

This amendment would also exclude beer, wine, distilled spirits, and hard cider projects from being eligible for VAPG. It is completely arbitrary and foolish to restrict these products.

In my State of Maine, there has been an explosion of craft breweries, distilleries, and cideries that are contributing to the local economy.

Two years ago, Ricker Hill Orchards in Maine received VAPG money to increase production of hard cider and fruit wine. This provided the farmers with an opportunity to diversify revenue and reach new markets.

This may be a very small program, but it can make a big impact on farmers and rural communities in States like mine and across the country.

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

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, "a bad situation worse"? You want to see a bad situation? How about this: Just in the District of Columbia, \$3.5 billion in 2010 in direct economic costs; \$179 billion of the total cost of alcohol consumption comes from a loss in workplace productivity.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have anything for or against, or want to promote prohibition or anything of the like. The matter is that these crops can stand on their own. They receive \$8 million a year nearly, \$7.67 million from the alcohol industry in lobbying costs. They already have their promoters. These crops can stand on their own. However, of the \$18 million in this Value Added fund, \$8 million of that goes to the alcohol industry.

So when we are talking about picking winners and losers, I think we have already seen who is being picked here, and it is the fleecing of the American people.

What about those that are new farmers, family farms, even veterans that are trying to enter the farming industry but they don't want to grow hops? Maybe they want to grow something that we eat that doesn't have a detrimental \$250 billion a year of an impact.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would argue that I would probably have to be drunk to think that the Government should both promote and curtail something at the same time.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I believe I have the right to close, so I would reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has the right to close.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chair, it is my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I have one speaker. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, how much time does the gentleman have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington State for the opportunity to yield to me to discuss this important issue.

Mr. Chair, this amendment, some in the room might think perhaps will target the Market Access Program, but, in fact, it is the Value Added Producer Grant program.

This is a program that supports and helps producers add value to the products that they raise.

I would tell you my chief concern at this point in time in the way this amendment has been offered is that about \$8 million of the rescissions of this program would come out of current programs that farmers have already applied for. USDA has already scored the applications, it has compiled proposals to make a decision and announcement on grant awards; thus, the amendment wouldn't just adversely affect the small producer-owned wineries, but producers across the board, including those from Oklahoma who have and expect to receive grants.

That is not fair. If you played by the rules, if you have gone through the grant process, if you have qualified, suddenly to have \$8 million taken out to punish a particular industry means that even though you might not be a part of that industry, you lose your opportunity to add value.

Maybe this is an issue that needs to be discussed on a different day in a different way, but I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I have the greatest of respect for my fellow Oklahoman, but on this occasion, let's turn this amendment back.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I certainly have the deepest respect for my colleague from Oklahoma, and he and I

see eye to eye on most issues, but on this one, it makes no sense that we spend nearly 40 percent of the Value Added program—which, by the way, I never addressed Market Access Program, that was never even mentioned—but the Value Added program is not adding value when \$250 billion of economic cost hits the United States; \$27 billion comes from healthcare expenses; \$25 billion to criminal justice; \$12.5 billion to vehicle crashes. We all pay for this.

□ 1845

But why should we both promote and curtail it? We spend millions of dollars in the Federal Government to control and contain abuse and also rehabilitation programs, which are good.

So we need to choose, Mr. Chairman. Are we for something, or are we against something? We may be one, we may be the other, but we cannot be both.

Mr. Chairman, I know these are contentious issues, but it is interesting to watch in the course of our politics over time. This is not a partisan issue; this is an American issue.

I say it is not partisan because if we were holding this debate 30 years ago you would have had a flip-flop, but as we have seen shift in parties in States and regions of the country, we might politically have parties go one direction or the other, but it seems like the special interests remain in the middle.

And if we are really talking about promoting value-added crops and entering new farmers in the workplace, then we don't need to give 40 percent to the alcohol industry when we already see nearly \$8 million given to them by lobbyists.

Mr. Chairman, I ask people to support this amendment. It saves the taxpayer dollars. These crops can stand on their own, and they can do it without the taxpayer subsidization and then our further spending to try to curtail it.

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

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

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 115-679.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 410, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 7113. RESEARCH AND EXTENSION FUNDING EQUITY FOR RECENTLY DESIGNATED 1890 INSTITUTIONS.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Section 1444(b) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3221(b)) is amended, in the matter following paragraph (2)(B), by adding at the end the following: “Beginning with fiscal year 2019, in making the calculation under paragraph (1), any recently designated 1890 Institution shall be deemed to have been designated as an eligible institution on or before September 30, 1978. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a ‘recently designated 1890 Institution’ means an 1890 Institution designated as such on or after September 30, 1999.”.

(b) **RESEARCH.**—Section 1445 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222) is amended— by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) Beginning with fiscal year 2019, in making the calculation under paragraph (2)(A), any recently designated 1890 Institution (as defined in section 1444(b)) shall be deemed to have been designated as an eligible institution on or before September 30, 1978.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of my amendment to the farm bill.

Mr. Chairman, I had a great conversation today with Secretary of Agriculture Perdue in which he spoke very highly of the students, faculty, and the president of Central State University during his visit to the university. Central State University is in my congressional district, and I want to thank Secretary Perdue for his leadership.

I am committed to working with the Secretary's office and all of the Historically Black Colleges to find a solution during the appropriations process to stop the disparate funding treatment currently in place. All 1890 land-grant institutions should be treated equally.

My commonsense and revenue-neutral amendment evens the playing field of Federal funding qualifications for all 1890 land-grant Historically Black Colleges, as it is currently written now.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for his support for my work on this amendment. I specifically want to thank JOYCE BEATTY, who supports the amendment and who is the only alumnus from Central State University.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. STEFANIK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 115-679.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Subtitle A of title VIII is amended by adding at the end the following:

SEC. 8109. INCLUSION OF INVASIVE VEGETATION IN DESIGNATED TREATMENT AREAS.

Section 602 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, invasive vegetation,” after “insect”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, invasive vegetation,” after “insects”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting “, invasive vegetation,” after “insect”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, our national forests are among our greatest natural resources. Unfortunately, these forests are under constant threat from invasive species and disease. You do not have to search far to find a forest battling invasive pests, disease, or invasive vegetation.

The Healthy Forest Restoration Act was created as a way to help respond to these persistent threats. My amendment before the House would simply add invasive vegetation to the Healthy Forest Restoration Act for the purposes of the designated treatment areas.

Invasive vegetation chokes out our native trees by competing for moisture, sunlight, nutrients, and space. Species like kudzu climb our trees and infrastructure and threaten the health and safety of the areas where it uncontrollably spreads.

When native trees are threatened, it is not just the ecosystem that is damaged. Local economies and sportsmen and those that use our land for other forms of recreation all suffer from degraded forestland.

Adding this designation increases the effectiveness of the Healthy Forest Restoration Act by taking a more encompassing view of the threats facing our forestland.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. CHENEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 115-679.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of part III of subtitle C of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 8334. VACANT GRAZING ALLOTMENTS MADE AVAILABLE TO CERTAIN GRAZING PERMIT HOLDERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary concerned shall, to the maximum extent practicable, make vacant grazing allotments available to a holder of a grazing permit or lease issued by such Secretary if the lands covered by the permit or lease are unusable because of a natural disaster (including a drought or wildfire), court-issued injunction, or conflict with wildlife, as determined by the Secretary concerned.

(b) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The terms and conditions contained in a permit or lease for a vacant grazing allotment made available pursuant to this subsection (a) shall be the terms and conditions of the most recent permit or lease that was applicable to such allotment.

(c) **COURT-ISSUED INJUNCTIONS.**—A court may not issue any order enjoining the use of any allotment for which a permit or lease has been issued by the Secretary concerned and continues in effect unless the Secretary concerned can make a vacant grazing allotment available to the holder of such permit or lease.

(d) **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT UNDER THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT.**—Activities carried out by the Secretary concerned pursuant to subsection (a) are a category of actions hereby designated as being categorically excluded from the preparation of an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

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

Mr. Chairman, livestock producers in Wyoming and across the West have been battling for years against a Federal Government that has attempted systematically to reduce grazing allotments on public lands.

My amendment would simply make vacant grazing allotments available for our producers should their existing allotments become unavailable due to unforeseen circumstances such as wildfire, drought, other natural disasters, or litigation.

Today, some of our ranch families are facing extreme hardship. They are at risk of losing their livelihood because of factors beyond their control. Frivolous lawsuits have often resulted in a complete loss of grazing rights for some of our producers who have been grazing on public lands for generations.

Mr. Chairman, these circumstances can lead to situations where our ranchers face two options. They either force their livestock to graze in confined conditions that are unsuitable and can't support the stock, or they have to sell their livestock at fire-sale prices.

We have seen family ranches go out of business and others that are now facing the prospect that their allotments will be lost within the next

year—this, all despite the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the Forest Service has vacant allotments available nearby.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would provide relief and justice for these family ranch operations. It would ensure that Federal agencies honor the terms of these allotments. Best management practices would be maintained, Mr. Chairman, by ensuring that the terms and the conditions of the original allotments are honored on the new ones.

Allowing our ranchers to move their livestock to vacant allotments is plain common sense, and it is the right thing to do, Mr. Chairman, for our livestock industry.

Our hardworking ranch families shouldn't face the potential of economic ruin because of natural disaster or frivolous lawsuits. My amendment will help protect them while we keep them on landscapes they have grazed on for generations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to provide stability and peace of mind for our ranchers across the West.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendment No. 20 offered by my friend Ms. CHENEY, and I am a proud cosponsor, as well, of this amendment.

This amendment would provide resources for ranchers that are facing unforeseeable events, like natural disasters.

In my district, particularly in the northern counties of north-central Washington, where catastrophic wildfires are becoming far too common an occurrence, ranchers can be forced off of their allotments due to wildfires causing their land to be unsuitable for grazing. When these ranchers are forced off of these allotments due to these external factors, they have nowhere to take their livestock.

This amendment will provide a solution to this problem by allowing these ranchers to take their livestock to vacant allotments in the event they face one of these unfortunate but all too common occurrences.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 20, and I thank my colleague Ms. CHENEY for her leadership on this issue.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my cosponsor, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and I would also like to thank Chairman CONAWAY for his work on this important bill overall.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that will just provide justice for our ranch families.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT) having assumed the chair, Mr. GALLAGHER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ICELAND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-127)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith a social security totalization agreement with Iceland, titled "Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland" and the accompanying legally binding administrative arrangement, titled "Administrative Arrangement between the Competent Authorities of the United States of America and Iceland for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland" (collectively the "Agreements"). The Agreements were signed at Reykjavik, Iceland, on September 27, 2016.

The Agreements are similar in objective and content to the social security totalization agreements already in force with other leading economic partners in Europe and elsewhere, including Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Agreements contain all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and, pursuant to section 233(c)(4), other provisions which I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the estimated number of individuals who will be affected by the Agreements

and the Agreements' estimated cost effect. Also included are a summary of the main provisions of the Agreements and an annotated version of the Agreements with descriptions of each article. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration concluded that these Agreements are in the national interest of the United States.

I commend to the Congress the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland and the Administrative Arrangement between the Competent Authorities of the United States of America and Iceland for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 2018.

□ 1900

HONORING INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LIONS CLUB, MULTIPLE DISTRICT 14

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the International Association of Lions Club, Multiple District 14, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Lions Multiple District 14 will host its 95th annual convention at the Penn Stater Conference Center today through Sunday. They will proudly welcome the Lions Club International president, Dr. Naresh Aggarwal, of Batala, Punjab, India.

Mr. Speaker, this group is near and dear to my heart, as I am a member of my local Lions Club, having served also as a Scoutmaster of that Lions Scout troop.

The Lions are the world's largest service club, with more than 18,900 Lions in Pennsylvania and nearly 1.45 million Lions worldwide.

The Lions focus on five areas of service: diabetes; environment; hunger relief; pediatric cancer; and probably the most well-known area of service, vision. Thanks to the 692 Lions Clubs in Pennsylvania, residents benefit from services like chartering units of the Boy Scouts of America, operating a year-round camp for people with vision challenges, supporting a camp for children with health challenges, and offering scholarships for students.

Mr. Speaker, the Lions do so much for so many in need. I wish them the best of luck as they host their 95th convention and live out their motto: We serve.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I recognize National Police Week; however, every day I am aware that officers protect and serve, put their lives on the line each day they serve, and some give their lives for that service.

I also recognize what officers realize, that their sacrifice and service is for everybody: people they know and don't know, and people who love them and people who hate them.

That is a big part of why our officers should be recognized, because no matter who it is, no matter what the danger is, police are trained to and police do what we naturally don't do as civilians: they run towards the danger, not away from it.

As a former prosecutor, I worked with many law enforcement officers that I will never forget. More importantly, there are victims and victims' family members who will never forget the service of police, including the family of Azahel Cruz, a 6-year-old that was killed in a drive-by shooting.

The case went unsolved for 5 years; however, due to the dogged determination of Officer Tom Larkin and DA Investigator Peter Austin, witnesses were found, evidence was presented, I proved the case at trial, and a murderer was convicted and removed from the streets for good.

Police work will never replace the life of Azahel, but that service and the service and sacrifice of our officers is exactly why we recognize our police officers this week.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MELISSA RAMIREZ

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Melissa Ramirez. Melissa attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Melissa loved her family more than anything in the world. She always made sure to take trips home over the weekends while she was studying at California State University to get her bachelor's degree in business administration.

After she graduated from college in 2014, Melissa began working as a member specialist for an auto insurer, where she continued to work until her life tragically ended at the Route 91 festival.

Melissa loved country music, but loved the Philadelphia Eagles more. She enjoyed watching sporting events and supporting each of her favorite teams.

Melissa was known for being a hard worker, deeply loving her family, and making sure to always enjoy life.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my condolences to Melissa Ramirez' family and friends. Please note that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

THREAT ASSESSMENT AND PROTECTIVE INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, imagine if someone came up and introduced himself to you and said: "Hi, I am Nick. I am a school shooter." According to those who knew him, Nikolas Cruz, the deranged Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School murderer, was known to do just that.

He attacked a neighbor's car. He shot their animals. He was known to vandalize and steal property. He made alarming social media posts and was expelled from school. There were multiple reports to local police and the FBI, and many other egregious red flags waving long before 17 innocent lives were taken and another 17 wounded on February 14, 2018. In the 7 years leading up to the shooting, police visited Cruz' home 39 times—incredibly.

Mr. Speaker, the Parkland shooting should have never happened. Every warning sign was there. They were not missed. Officials just failed to connect the dots.

I wish that I could say that this failure is unique to Parkland, but, sadly, it is not. Nearly 20 years ago, high school junior Brooks Brown came across a website where a fellow classmate threatened to kill him and his family. Brown's parents alerted the local police, who were already aware of concerning behaviors from that website's author and another involved student.

Within only a few months, these same students, Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold, would murder 13 and wound 24 Columbine High School students in what has been called the first modern mass shooting. Again, the red flags were detected, but the appropriate steps were not taken.

This is not a new phenomenon. In 1966, Charles Whitman sought help from a psychiatrist at the University of Texas for "overwhelming periods of hostility," including wanting to, "go up in the tower . . . and start shooting people." Six months later, he would carry out his sick fantasy exactly as he described: 16 dead and 31 wounded.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, this list goes on and on: the Pulse nightclub, the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, the Boston Marathon, the Washington Navy Yard, the attack on Congresswoman Gabby Giffords in Tucson, Sandy Hook Elementary School, the Aurora theater, Virginia Tech, the Norwegian summer camp, West Nickel Mines Amish school, the Charleston church massacre, the attack on Republican Members of Congress at baseball practice, and even the YouTube and Tennessee Waffle House shooting just a few weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, all of these horrifying events on this nonexhaustive list have

something in common: every single one of these attacks was carried out after someone close to the killer observed and reported concerning behavior to the authorities.

The good news is there is something that we can do to fix this. These killers were under law enforcement's watch, but a proactive threat management structure, in large part, does not exist in the culture and fabric of contemporary law enforcement today.

For starters, our local law enforcement is simply undertrained, understaffed, underequipped, and have no integrated system in place to effectively identify and address these types of threats. The lack of information-sharing capabilities between the local, State, and Federal law enforcement, school officials, mental health professionals, social services, and other community-based organizations prevent these key players from implementing an effective intervention strategy directed at those who are on the pathway to violence.

For decades, there has been an effective system in place, pioneered by the Secret Service, that has successfully worked to protect our Presidents and other public figures. I believe that it is time to take a page out of the Secret Service's playbook and address this critical national security issue by implementing their established and proven threat management process for identifying, investigating, evaluating, and mitigating threats as a critical means to protecting our communities.

Currently, threat assessment and protective intelligence is used as a method for gathering and evaluating information about a person who may have the motive, intention, and capability to mount an attack against public figures. The Secret Service will gauge a potential threat, assess the vulnerability of the targeted individuals, and guide an intervention when necessary. This proactive process leaves no stone unturned.

This approach is entirely different from what the FBI and local law enforcement currently use because it compiles information from a variety of comprehensive sources to build out a threat assessment, and it works. Since the 1981 attempted assassination of President Reagan, nobody has even come close.

If this system works to protect the life of the President, elected officials, foreign dignitaries, and even celebrities, why couldn't this also work to protect our children and local communities?

Whether it is a shooting, a stabbing, a weaponized vehicle, or a bombing, mass casualty events are occurring more and more frequently at home and abroad. It is more important now than ever that we act.

Incorporating threat assessment and protective intelligence into all facets of law enforcement will save lives. If we can properly recognize the warnings and act, we can prevent targeted violence. It is time that we put an end to

the politicized gun-grabbing rhetoric and start tackling the real root of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in support of National Police Week, an important celebration of the men and women who serve our communities as members of law enforcement.

This week, we also observed Peace Officers Memorial Day and remembered all of those members of the thin blue line who have lost their lives so the rest of us can be safe.

Throughout my life, I have had the opportunity to work with so many brave Rhode Island police officers, and I am particularly proud that when I was mayor of the city of Providence, as a result of a citywide community policing model, we saw the lowest crime rate in the city in 40 years. That was because of the wonderful trust that had been developed between the community and the police department, and the police department being willing to fully engage in the life of the community. Police officers served on housing boards and community center boards and became part of the community, and, of course, that work continues today.

There are many, many stories about the extraordinary heroism and dedication and hard work of our men and women in uniform, but very often their really heroic work is in these untold stories.

One of those stories I would like to talk about tonight is a story that really exemplifies the important work that police do in our communities that makes a real difference in the lives of those they serve.

Earlier this year, the Pawtucket Police Department went above and beyond the call of duty to help a family in the city of Pawtucket. Hilary Bilbraut and her family were getting ready to celebrate their daughter, Destiny's, ninth birthday. Destiny, who suffers from a rare blood disorder that causes high fevers, had been eagerly waiting for her birthday trip to Legoland in Florida, where she could take pictures with her beloved camera.

Instead, Destiny and her family came home to an apartment ransacked by thieves. They took everything they could get their hands on. They took the family television. They took Destiny's camera. They took her tickets to Legoland. They even took her birthday cake.

In describing the aftermath to police, Hilary said the thieves stole more than just that: they stole Destiny's peace of mind. Since the break-in, she had been haunted by nightmares and constantly crying.

Pawtucket Police Officer Brian Beech was the first to respond to the break-in. Officer Beech was heartbroken by Destiny's story. He immediately

began reaching out to his fellow officers for donations to help replace the stolen items.

Working together with Sergeant Kenneth Dolan, officers of the Pawtucket Police Department raised \$400 to replace the television. One of the officers donated his camera.

They contacted Queen B's Cakery in Johnston, who donated a birthday cake. They even reached out to Legoland, who put together a trip to replace Destiny's stolen tickets, complete with a limousine ride to the airport.

Destiny was ecstatic. She was already talking about returning the gesture.

When asked why they went above and beyond, Sergeant Dolan said: We wanted to show her that there are more good people in the world than bad.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one example showing exactly why police officers do what they do. The men and women of our Nation's law enforcement deserve our utmost respect and our deepest gratitude.

I look forward to working with my colleagues here in Congress, members of the Rhode Island State and local law enforcement agencies, and local community leaders on the ways we can continue to support our great men and women in uniform.

I want to thank Congressman KNIGHT for organizing this Special Order hour this evening. Our last evening had to get postponed, but I really appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to offer a few thoughts this evening during National Police Week to say thank you again to the men and women who serve in our community to keep us safe, who do incredibly dangerous work and without whom we would not have safe communities.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2349. An act to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to establish an interagency working group to study Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence and to make recommendations on the harmonization of such efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 18, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4879. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing eighteen (18) officers to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4880. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter approving the sale of beer and wine in military commissaries, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2484(c); Public Law 99-661, Sec. 313(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-375, Sec. 651(a)(5)); (118 Stat. 1966); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4881. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report certifying that the export of the listed items to the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778 note; Public Law 105-261, Sec. 1512 (as amended by Public Law 105-277, Sec. 146); (112 Stat. 2174); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4882. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination and certification that five countries are not cooperating fully with U.S. antiterrorism efforts, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2781(b); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 40A (as added Public Law 104-132, Sec. 330); (110 Stat. 1258); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4883. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, U.S. Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Foreign Trade Regulations (FTR): Clarification on the Collection and Confidentiality of Kimberley Process Certificates [Docket Number: 140905758-8166-02] (RIN: 0607-AA54) received May 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4884. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's summary and URL to the inventories of commercial and inherently governmental positions for fiscal year 2016, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4885. A letter from the Deputy Inspector General for Audit Services, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the final report, entitled "U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Met Many Requirements of the Improper Payment Information Act of 2002 but Did Not Fully Comply for Fiscal Year 2017", pursuant to Public Law 107-300 as amended, and Public Law 111-204; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4886. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — DoD Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Program [Docket ID: DOD-2017-OS-0028] (RIN: 0790-AI51) received April 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4887. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Investigative Service (DIS) Freedom of Information Act Program [Docket ID: DOD-2017-OS-0026] (RIN: 0790-AJ67) received May 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4888. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department

of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) Freedom of Information Act [Docket ID: DOD-2017-OS-0022] (RIN: 0790-AJ63) received May 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4889. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Imagery Mapping Agency (NIMA) Freedom of Information Act Program [Docket ID: DOD-2017-OS-0023] (RIN: 0790-AJ64) received May 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4890. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Security Agency/Central Security Service (NSA/CSS) Freedom of Information Act Program [Docket ID: DOD-2017-OS-0027] (RIN: 0790-AJ68) received May 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4891. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, General Law and Research Division, OGC, Office of the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment for 2018 (RIN: 0510-AA04) received April 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4892. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31189; Amdt. No.: 3796] received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4893. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31188; Amdt. No.: 3795] received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4894. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31192; Amdt. No.: 539] (received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4895. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Area R-4403A; Stennis Space Center, MS [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1109; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASO-22] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4896. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Seven Springs, PA, and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Somerset, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0610; Airspace Docket

No.: 17-AEA-13] received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4897. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0711; Product Identifier 2017-NM-003-AD; Amendment 39-19227; AD 2018-06-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4898. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International S.A. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0380; Product Identifier 2018-NE-14-AD; Amendment 39-19267; AD 2018-09-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4899. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Safran Helicopters Engines, S.A., Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0184; Product Identifier 2018-NE-07-AD; Amendment 39-19248; AD 2018-07-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4900. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0906; Product Identifier 2017-NM-039-AD; Amendment 39-19252; AD 2018-07-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4901. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Austro Engine GmbH Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0153; Product Identifier 2018-NE-03-AD; Amendment 39-19247; AD 2018-07-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4902. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0553; Product Identifier 2016-NM-208-AD; Amendment 39-19250; AD 2018-07-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4903. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0770; Product Identifier 2017-NM-030-AD; Amendment 39-19251; AD 2018-07-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4904. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0299; Product Identifier 2018-NM-060-AD; Amendment 39-19256; AD 2018-08-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4905. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0304; Product Identifier 2018-NM-065-AD; Amendment 39-19261; AD 2018-09-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4906. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0314; Product Identifier 2018-NE-11-AD; Amendment 39-19255; AD 2018-08-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4907. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the 2017 Highway Freight Conditions and Performance Report to Congress, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 167(h); Public Law 112-141, Sec. 1115(a) (as amended by Public Law 114-94, Sec. 1116(a)) (129 Stat. 1353); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4908. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received April 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4909. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Determination of Housing Cost Amounts Eligible for Exclusion or Deduction for 2018 [Notice 2018-44] received May 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4910. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Management, United States Capitol Police, transmitting the Statement of Disbursements for the United States Capitol Police for the period of October 1, 2017, through March 31, 2018, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1910(a); Public Law 109-55, Sec. 1005; (119 Stat. 575) (H. Doc. No. 115—126); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs.

NAPOLITANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 5857. A bill to protect transportation personnel and passengers from sexual assault and harassment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 5858. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require coverage without a deductible of certain primary care services by high deductible health plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 5859. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require that a portion of revenues from new Federal mineral and geothermal leases be paid to States for use to supplement the education of students in kindergarten through grade 12 and public support of institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HUIZENG, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. KIND, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COOK, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LATTI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 5860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow first responders to continue to exclude service-connected disability pension payments after reaching the age of retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. NUNES, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. REED, Mr. RENACCI, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5861. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5862. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, to require the voluntary collection of demographic information for patent applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 5863. A bill to limit the transfer of F-35 aircraft to Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H.R. 5864. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish qualifications for the human resources positions within the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5865. A bill to establish programs related to prevention of prescription opioid misuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5866. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize individuals who are pursuing programs of rehabilitation, education, or training under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to receive work-study allowances for certain outreach services provided through congressional offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 5867. A bill to authorize a joint action plan and report on drug waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTI, Mr. DAVIDSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TURNER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 5868. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 530 Claremont Avenue in Ashland, Ohio, as the "Bill Harris Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. BACON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 5869. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a maritime border threat analysis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 5870. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require immediate notification to an employer of the issuance of a penalty, to prohibit any public notice of such citation for a period of 24 hours after issuance of the citation, and to require a public notice where an employer successfully contests any proposed penalty; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LAMB (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 5871. A bill to provide grants to State, local, territorial, and tribal law enforcement agencies to purchase chemical screening devices and train personnel to use chemical screening devices in order to enhance law enforcement efficiency and protect law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 5872. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the deduction for State and local taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCGOV-

ERN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 5873. A bill to disclose the use of Federal funds with any privately held company owned by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JONES (for himself and Mr. CLEAVER):

H. Res. 901. A resolution calling on and encouraging the White House to issue a public apology; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. SOTO):

H. Res. 902. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the obligation of the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice to enforce title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its implementing regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRAT:

H. Res. 903. A resolution protecting 1st Amendment Rights of Free Speech and Free Exercise while condemning any form of criminal behavior, threats or violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 5858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 5859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 5860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 5861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States, . . .

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 5864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 5867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 5868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7, of the Constitution empowers Congress "To establish Post Offices and post Roads".

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 5869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution

"All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

Congress shall have the power . . . "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 5870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LAMB:

H.R. 5871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 5872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Sixteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 5873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Disclosing Official Spending at Presidential Businesses Act is constitutionally authorized under Article II, Section 1, Clause

7, and as well as Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 99: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 110: Mr. TONKO, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 200: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 210: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 299: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 333: Mr. CRIST, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 389: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 489: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 754: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 781: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 788: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 809: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 817: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1046: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1130: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 1150: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. ROYCE of California.
H.R. 1201: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1318: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1352: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 1447: Mr. COHEN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SOTO, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1615: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1683: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1697: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 1928: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 2101: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2106: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 2150: Mr. OLSON, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2259: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 2261: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 2315: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2472: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2486: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2748: Mr. ROYCE of California.
H.R. 2787: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2856: Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 2902: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 3030: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. ROYCE of California.
H.R. 3059: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 3712: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 4022: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. MAST.
H.R. 4107: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 4167: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 4238: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 4256: Mrs. HANDEL, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. FASO, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 4271: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 4319: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4410: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4411: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4454: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 4472: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4549: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 4556: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4684: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 4691: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4693: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4775: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 4843: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 4944: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 4953: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 4989: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 5026: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 5085: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 5158: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 5199: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 5248: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 5282: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 5329: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 5339: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 5343: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 5385: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 5414: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 5460: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 5467: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 5471: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 5477: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 5486: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 5497: Mr. WALZ and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 5510: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 5533: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 5571: Mr. WELCH and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5590: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 5602: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 5621: Mr. POSEY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 5626: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 5658: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 5671: Mr. JONES and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 5682: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 5701: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 5717: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 5735: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 5736: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 5746: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 5747: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 5754: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 5760: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 5761: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 5780: Mr. GAETZ, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 5796: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 5797: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 5808: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 5812: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 5819: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MAST, and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 5836: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.J. Res. 129: Mr. LAMB and Mr. RUIZ.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. COSTA.
H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. STEWART.

H. Con. Res. 119: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. POSEY.

H. Res. 199: Ms. MATSUI.

H. Res. 763: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. MEEKS.
H. Res. 781: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Res. 785: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. SMUCKER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LOUDERMILK,

Mr. MAST, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BRAT, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LONG, Mr. BLUM, Ms. CHENEY, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. HUIZENGA,

Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. RUSSELL.

H. Res. 826: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BARR, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. FASO, Mr. HIMES,

Mr. BEYER, and Mr. ROKITA.

H. Res. 861: Mr. MAST.

H. Res. 868: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. LATTA.

H. Res. 869: Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 893: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. FITZPATRICK.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 17, 2018

No. 81

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable DEAN HELLER, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

King of Glory, robed with honor and majesty, enter the hearts of our lawmakers today, and use them for Your glory. Fortify them with the knowledge that You will never leave or forsake them.

Lord, show them Your ways and teach them Your path. Leaning on Your wisdom, may they make ethical decisions that will receive Heaven's approval. Undergird them with Your might, enabling them to accomplish with Your power what they could not do on their own.

We pray in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 17, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DEAN HELLER, a Sen-

ator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HELLER thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 847, Gina Haspel.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gina Haspel, of Kentucky, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Gina Haspel, of Kentucky, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, James Lankford, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, John Hoeven, David Perdue, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, James E.

Risch, John Thune, Todd Young, Ron Johnson, Cory Gardner.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion be waived.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

NOMINATION OF GINA HASPEL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, the Intelligence Committee took an important step toward confirming Gina Haspel to become the next Director of the CIA. A bipartisan majority voted to report her nomination favorably to the Senate. I look forward to promptly moving to a confirmation vote.

The committee's confidence is indicative of the strength of Ms. Haspel's testimony and her 30-plus-year record of CIA service. Throughout the process, she demonstrated candor, integrity, and a forthright approach to the committee's questions. She displayed the talent and expertise that make her uniquely qualified to face America's biggest national security challenges, whether in the area of counterterrorism or renewed international competition among great powers.

Out of the spotlight, whether at Langley or deployed abroad, Ms. Haspel has quietly earned the respect and admiration of those who matter most—the men and women of the CIA and distinguished current and former intelligence community leaders.

The safety and security of the American people depend on capable intelligence leadership. Gina Haspel is the

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2735

right woman at the right time. Senators on both sides of the aisle agree. So I urge each of my colleagues to rise to the occasion and swiftly confirm our next CIA Director.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, with Republican policies shaking the regulatory rust off of the U.S. economy, American job creators, entrepreneurs, and working families have been thinking big again.

For 8 years, Democrats pushed a one-size-fits-all agenda that heaped outsized benefits on the largest cities and left the rest of the country struggling to catch up. Now Main Street businesses across America feel the wind is at their backs. So they are expanding their operations, buying more equipment, and hiring new workers.

For too long, taxpayers grappled with an outdated Federal Tax Code that seemed to keep more of their hard-earned income every year. Now, thanks to Republican tax reform, working families are seeing paychecks grow, special bonuses hit their bank accounts, and will send thousands of dollars less to the IRS next year.

Now that Congress and the President have put a stop to the last administration's rampant, top-down Federal rule-making, U.S. manufacturing is churning back to life as well. The new economic climate that is taking hold across the country has producers feeling more confident about planting deeper roots right here in the United States—new capital investment, new factories, new American jobs.

Novelis, a leading producer of rolled and recycled aluminum, broke ground just this week on a new factory in Guthrie, KY. The company is choosing the Commonwealth in which to build the 400,000-square-foot facility and create at least 125 new jobs, and they are not keeping any secrets about what is helping them make this investment. Here is a quote: "A favorable economic environment," including "the significant positive impact of tax reform in the U.S., reinforces Novelis' decision to expand at this time."

This is not just a Kentucky phenomenon. According to new survey data from the National Association of Manufacturers, more than 93 percent of U.S. manufacturing firms have a positive outlook. Already, 77 percent of manufacturers are reporting hiring new workers, and 86 percent say they are investing in plants and equipment.

Many American communities revolve around these manufacturing facilities. Sadly, during the Obama years, they were among the most likely to be left behind by the so-called "recovery," but now that is changing. Today, manufacturing wages are growing at their fastest pace in 17 years. These are just a few signs of our Nation's economic comeback under Republicans' pro-growth, pro-opportunity agenda.

Remember, not one of our Democratic colleagues voted with us to set

this train in motion—not one. They voted against cutting redtape for American manufacturers. They voted against the tax reforms that are growing paychecks and helping to create new jobs. They voted against the newly lowered utility rates that benefit both families and employers.

My Democratic colleagues like to talk about supporting the middle class. These days, it is looking more and more like that is all it is—just talk. Yet, while they occupy themselves with partisan politics, Republicans will keep on clearing the tracks and letting the American economy roll on ahead.

TRIBUTE TO BRENDAN DUNN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now, speaking of tax reform, I have to bid farewell to an outstanding member of my staff.

Brendan Dunn has been a key member of my leadership office team for the last 6 years. He has made an outsized impact as a trusted counselor and friend.

I, actually, stole Brendan from the Finance Committee in 2012. I am not sure if Chairman HATCH ever quite forgave me for it. If you have ever had the pleasure of witnessing Brendan in action, you will understand why he is a sought-after commodity, whether you need deep expertise on tax policy or the perfect movie quote for any occasion.

Brendan has been my trusted adviser on issues including tax policy, banking, trade, and pensions. So I am just glad that his last few months in the office could be a calm and laid-back period. All he had to do was play a leading role in crafting generational tax reform and help steer it across the finish line. Oh, then came Dodd-Frank reform, for good measure.

This Maryland native holds degrees from Holy Cross, Fordham, Georgetown, and Notre Dame, but you would not know that this unassuming leader and reliable source of comic relief holds a J.D. and a Ph.D. in political philosophy unless you needed to. That is the kind of guy Brendan is.

His many contributions to my team have benefited this body, the people of Kentucky, and the Nation. I know everyone who has gotten to work closely with him is sad to see him depart the Senate. I certainly am. Yet I have a hunch that his lovely wife, Lee, and his children—Patrick, Audrey, and Mary—will not mind seeing a little bit more of him.

So I offer Brendan my sincere thanks for a job very well done and wish him Godspeed for what lies ahead.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2019—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 36.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 384, S. Con. Res. 36, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2019 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2020 through 2028.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 45 minutes under the control of Senator PAUL or his designee and 45 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, this year there will be no budget presented by the Republicans or the Democrats. I think that is a bad idea. I think the government should have a budget. There should be a document that says what we are for, what we are against, and how we are going to spend our money. I think it is particularly important because we are incurring so much debt.

We may remember when Republicans campaigned against enormous spending by President Obama and \$1 trillion annual deficits. Now we are faced with enormous spending and \$1 trillion annual deficits from Republicans. I think it is important that we have a discussion about this.

Do we have too much debt? Some will say: Well, I have debt for my house, and that is not bad. The country has a lot of debt that they borrow against capital expenditures—things that don't expire. I think there is some truth to that. You can have a manageable amount of debt, particularly if it is against something you are borrowing that doesn't go away. But if you are borrowing money for the grocery store or for your apartment, that might be a bad thing. It will not last very long. You will do it for a month or two, and pretty soon the bank will come calling. So there is a point at which debt is too cumbersome, and there is too much of it.

Carmen Reinhart of the University of Maryland and Kenneth Rogoff of Harvard did a study linking debt to economic growth. They concluded that when a country exceeds 90 percent of their GDP, when their debt is almost

equal to their GDP, economic growth begins to slow, and you lose probably 1 to 2 points just because of the burden of the debt. This is all of the debt—what the government owes to the public at large and to themselves. They said that when it exceeds 90 percent, it is a problem. Currently, our debt is at 105 percent; our gross public debt is 105 percent of our GDP.

We now have a national debt of about \$21 trillion. Historically, Congress had sort of a cover on this. Congress would try to rein in the debt. There would be a big debate every time we raised the debt ceiling. Congress would have to lift it each time, and there was some punishment out there for those who voted to raise the debt ceiling.

Now we don't raise the debt ceiling by a certain amount because that became embarrassing and limiting, making them come back each time to try to raise the debt ceiling. Now what we do is raise it for a period of time.

Currently, the debt ceiling has been raised, and you can spend as much as you want for a little over a year. We did it, I believe, back in December. For about 1½ years, the government can borrow as much as they can possibly borrow for that period of time. Basically, there is no limit. The debt ceiling vote has become a meaningless vote because we just raise it for a period of time.

Is the debt a problem? How much interest do we pay on the debt? We pay \$300 billion in interest. You say: Well, is that a problem? Paying on the interest crowds out other things that you want from the government. So when people come to my office and say "I want this from my government," I say "Well, part of the problem is we are paying \$300 billion in interest, and part of the problem is we don't have anything to give you because we are borrowing about 25 percent of every dollar we spend."

Every time the government spends a dollar, 25 percent of that is borrowed. This is on current accounts of things people want. For example, if I were to ask you: Is it a good idea to borrow money to give to your church? People say: Well, my church is a good thing, and I want to give money to my church. But is it a good idea and will it last very long if you go to the bank to borrow 25 percent of every dollar you spend and tithe 25 percent to your church? You say: My church is a good thing. But is it a good thing to borrow that money, and will the bank keep loaning you that money, and are there repercussions to having so much debt?

We have a \$300 billion interest payment at about a 2-percent interest rate. The interest rate is manipulated by the Federal Reserve, and there are those who report that the main reason the interest rates are kept low by the Federal Reserve is not necessarily to stimulate economic growth; it is to finance this enormous burden of debt.

What happens when interest rates normalize? Many are predicting they

will. As economic growth begins to pick up, you are going to see an acceleration in interest rates. What happens at 5 percent? Can we even manage our debt at 5 percent?

People have looked at what the interest will be, even saying interest rates stay stable, and they say that within about a decade, interest rates will exceed all other payments of the government. The estimate is that within 10 years, interest payments alone will be about \$761 billion—greater than national defense, greater than any other area of the budget. Even now, the second biggest item in the budget after defense is interest.

So some say: But we have to finance the military, and the military needs more money. That is why you hear Republicans now no longer caring about the debt. They got more money for the military, but they had to make an unholy alliance with Democrats and give them more for social welfare. So we have guns and butter. Everybody gets what they want—except for the taxpayer and those of us who care about the debt.

So the debt has exploded now under Republican control. You say: Well, don't we need it for the military?

Well, I think there are some arguments we should probably engage in before we decide that. We have doubled the amount in nominal terms that we spend on the military since 9/11. In real terms, there is about a 36-percent increase in national defense. We spend more on the military than the next eight countries combined.

There is an argument that it isn't necessarily that the budget has not grown enough, but it is that maybe the military mission is too large. Maybe it is not that the budget is too small but that our military mission is too large, that we are at war in too many places around the globe and that we should reassess that.

Many Republicans will say: Well, that is all good and well, but really the culprit is entitlements.

Entitlements are growing at 6 percent—Social Security, Medicare, food stamps. There is truth to that, but watch closely the people who tell you that the problem is entitlements and ask yourself if they are doing anything to fix entitlements. Ask them whether they have put forward a bill on the floor of the Senate to rein in spending and entitlements. Ask them whether they have even cosponsored a bill or whether they are agitating for a bill to rein in entitlements. No. They are petrified of looking at entitlements. So everybody complains about it, and nobody does anything about it.

Everybody says they are for a balanced budget. Yet, when we have a vote in a few minutes on a budget that actually balances in 5 years, consistent with the balanced budget amendment, I think we will get a handful—maybe a dozen or maybe two dozen. But the majority of Republicans will say: Oh my goodness, we could never cut spending.

So in the abstract, they are for a balanced budget. They are for a balanced budget amendment. They will all vote for it. They will all come down here. I think we had a unanimous vote a few years ago. Republicans all voted for the balanced budget amendment. Just a month ago in the House, all the people who voted to bust the budget caps, all the people who voted for the extra spending, all these Republicans then voted for the balanced budget amendment, which says you have to balance in 5 years. Typically, when they have brought forward a budget, they have tried to balance it in 10 years and struggled. So they vote for a balanced budget amendment that balances in 5 years, and yet they struggle to come up with a budget that is not fake to balance in 10 years.

We passed a budget last year. It was a Republican budget. I voted against it because I think it had fake cuts in it, and it had fake reporting, and they weren't serious about it. I will give an example. The budget last year that the Republicans passed had about \$4 trillion in entitlement savings over 10 years. You say: Well, did they enact any of that? Zero. Do they have any bills to do any entitlement reform? Zero. Did we ever debate and vote on any bills that would have done anything to entitlement spending? No. In fact, in the first year of the Republican budget last year, there was \$96 billion—that is a significant savings—all in entitlements, and yet nobody had a bill that even went to committee. There was never a committee vote. There was never a floor vote. No one lifted a finger to do anything about entitlement spending.

So it is a canard for those who say: Well, the real problem is not military; the real problem is not nonmilitary discretionary; the real problem is entitlements. Sure, entitlements are growing faster, but unless we are doing something about it, it is simply saying: Oh, we have to keep spending over here because the real problem is over here, but we are not going to do anything over here, which runs into really the hypocrisy that we face today.

I have often said that the Republican Party is an empty vessel unless we imbue it with value. We say we are against big spending. We say we are against big government. We say we are for devolving power, structure, and money back to the States. Yet the government grows under Democrats and it grows under Republicans.

Democrats are sometimes more honest about wanting to grow government. They will go home and say they are going to make government big enough to put a ham on every table, a chicken in every pot. They are a little bit more honest about it. Republicans go home and say they believe in the free market. They go to the Rotary Club and say: Well, I voted for the balanced budget amendment. But the question is, Why won't they vote for an actual budget that balances? Why won't they

vote for a budget that actually is consistent with the balanced budget amendment?

So what I have done is put forward my own budget. It is something I have talked about for several years now. It wasn't originally my idea; others have talked about it. It is called the penny plan. It says that we would cut one penny out of every dollar the Federal Government spends—1 percent. Could we not get to a point where we could actually cut one penny out of every dollar? Isn't there enough waste going on in government that we could actually cut a penny out of every dollar?

Like everything else, people argue the numbers. There is a lot of fake math that goes on around here. Those on the left will say, oh, but this will be cutting \$13 trillion, when, in fact, it might not cut any. For example, if we were to freeze government spending for 10 years, the left would say: You have cut spending by \$15 trillion because we were going to increase spending by \$15 trillion. So it is sort of fake accounting. If we spend \$3.2 trillion and next year we spend \$32 billion less, that is a 1-percent cut, but the left will say: Oh, no, we were going to increase spending by 6 percent, and so you are really cutting spending by 7 percent. This enormous number comes up, but in reality, we are taking last year's spending—\$3.2 trillion—and we are going to cut it by 1 percent, \$30 billion. If we do that every year for 5 years, the budget balances.

You say: Well, some people might not get all their money. Yes, there would be some programs across government that would get less. I challenge any American to call up my office and present proof that there is not 1 percent waste and fraud in any program going on. I will give an example. The earned-income tax credit and the child tax credit are estimated to have 25 percent fraud. For years, you could get this credit without a Social Security number. You could simply say: My kids and I don't have one. The government would generate a taxpayer ID number for you and give you a refund. This is to the tune of billions of dollars. It is about \$100 billion in the EITC, the earned-income tax credit, and the additional child credit—many of those going to people who were in our country illegally and had no Social Security number.

There is waste from top to bottom in government. How would you ever find it? See, many people in this body on both sides of the aisle will say: I am for rooting out waste. Yet you never find waste if you keep giving them more money. If you reward government agencies with more money, you are never going to get less waste.

The penny plan budget I am presenting would cut 1 percent. Does anybody in America think government couldn't do with 1 percent less? Many American families have had a bad year here and there and have to deal with more than 1 percent less. One percent

of this enormous government, if it were cut each year, would go a long way toward making us a stronger nation.

People say: Well, what about the military? I think that if the government ran a balanced budget, we would have a stronger and more secure nation. Admiral Mullen said he thought the No. 1 threat to our national security was actually our debt. So there are many realistic people, even high-ranking people in the military, who are saying: You know what, if we want to secure our Nation, we have to make sure that we have a sound economy and that we have a sound government that is not borrowing so much money.

How rapidly do we borrow money? We borrow \$1 million every minute—\$1 million a minute. In fact, it is a little bit higher than that now. It is about \$1.5 million, and the curve over the next 10 years gets to about \$2 million a minute. Imagine how fast the money is flying out of here. How big is \$1 million? People have said that if you put hundred-dollar bills in your hand, it is about 4 inches high to get to \$1 million. We are borrowing \$1 million or more every minute.

How would we get to \$30 billion? How could we possibly cut \$30 billion from the budget? I will give examples of where some of the money is.

Foreign aid is about \$30 billion. You say: Well, I want to help the poor people in the world. I am all for you. If you want to give out of your savings to help poor people around the world, all the benefit and all the accolades for being generous, but if you want to borrow money, you won't be able to do it for very long.

Should the U.S. Government borrow? We are going to borrow \$1 trillion this year. Should we borrow money to send it to poor countries, or should we borrow money to send armaments to countries? I think it is a big mistake. That is about \$30 billion. So if you were to cut 1 percent next year, you could actually cut 1 percent by simply eliminating foreign aid.

How much do we spend in Afghanistan building their roads, building their bridges, building their schools before they blow them up again and then we rebuild them again? We have rebuilt some buildings in Afghanistan seven times. That is nearly \$50 billion, which is about a year, year and a half, of the penny plan right there if we were to say: Guess what. We won the Afghan war, and we are not going to stay forever. We have some needs here at home that we are going to take care of and not send all that money to Afghanistan.

Corporate welfare. Rich corporations in our country—I am all for them. If they freely sell something to you and they make money because you like their product and buy it, more power to them, but if they want money from the Federal Government, that is ridiculous. I don't think private business should be getting any money from the Federal Government. It is estimated

that corporate welfare is over \$100 billion. I know for certain that we could find enough corporate welfare that we could actually, by eliminating corporate welfare, do 1 year of the penny plan.

Waste. Our office alone has found \$3 billion in waste.

Interest. It is \$300 billion, going up to \$760 billion.

There are a lot of areas in our government that we could actually look at and actually adhere to the penny plan and balance our budget. I would like to go through a few items.

If there is anybody in America who believes their government is not wasting their money, I would like to show them a few areas where the government is wasting their money.

My staff recently went to Afghanistan. This is a picture of a luxury hotel that your taxpayer dollars went to build. Your first question might be why your taxpayer dollars would be going to a luxury hotel in some Third World country. It is about 400 feet from our Embassy, and this is what it looks like. They have been building it for 11 years, and it is unfinished. Nothing was done to code, it is falling down, and at this point, the hotel is so dangerous that we have to send our soldiers to patrol it to make sure snipers aren't using the hotel to shoot at our Embassy. So it is not only a waste of \$90 million, never having been completed, but it is now a danger to our troops. The talk now is on how they are going to fix the problem.

Does anybody in Washington think we should spend less in Afghanistan? Virtually no one. Both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, can't spend money fast enough in Afghanistan. No one is making a stand and saying: Enough is enough. It is time to announce that we won, and it is time to come home. The money just keeps going, good money after bad—\$90 million for a hotel that will never be built.

To add insult to injury, do you know what they are going to do now? They are talking about selling the unfinished hotel. Do you know who they are going to sell it to? Another branch of government. So government built this—U.S. taxpayer dollars built this—and now they are going to sell it to the State Department. Do you know what the State Department is going to do with this luxury hotel in Kabul? They are going to tear it down. So that is \$90 million flushed down the toilet.

You can't tell me this waste isn't rotting in our government from top to bottom, and it is never rooted out. Why? Because we never give any agency less money; everybody gets more money. If you are running an agency or business and someone gives you more money, are you more likely to root out waste or less likely to root out waste? The only way they would ever root out waste is if they got a commandment—thou shalt do this—from Congress, from the Senate, to say: Enough is

enough. Let's declare victory and come home.

This hotel—\$90 million flushed down the toilet. It is now a danger to our troops, and they are going to tear it down. It was never completed.

Also, in Afghanistan, there is brandnew equipment that we send over there that is shredded. They have big, huge industrial shredders. My staff saw them. They found boxes of new equipment—electrical outlet boxes, all kinds of things—being shoved into the shredder. So we buy brandnew equipment, and it is shoved into the shredder. There is \$50 million of brandnew, never-used equipment that has been destroyed. This doesn't even count the old stuff we are destroying. There are reports that \$7 billion—7 with a "b," billion dollars—of used equipment, such as tanks, humvees, et cetera, has been destroyed. Why? Our allies are so unreliable, we are afraid that if we leave a tank or a humvee there, it might be taken by the opposition and used against us. So we have destroyed \$7 billion of it because it is cheaper to destroy it than to load it on planes and bring it over here. That is \$7 billion.

The Department of Defense loses \$29 million of heavy equipment. What does that mean? They can't find it. It can't be accounted for. They don't know where the equipment is. There is \$29 million unaccounted for in heavy equipment.

They tried to establish an Afghan equivalent for the Army Corps of Engineers and lost \$20 million of heavy equipment in the process.

There is \$28 million worth of uniforms that are missing. Someone got paid. We can't find the uniforms. We can't prove that anyone ever got the uniforms.

Even more troubling than that, there was \$700,000 worth of ammunition missing. You would think we could at least keep up with ammunition. Do you think that might be a danger and an insult to our young men and women we send to Afghanistan, that we can't account for where the ammunition is? I think if you can't account for it, there is a decent chance the enemy has your ammunition or rogue elements in the Afghan Government—which could be anyone—have sold it on the black market to make money.

Where does your money go? I want you to realize as Americans where your money is going. They spent \$500,000 to study if selfies make you happier. You take selfies of yourself smiling, then you look at them to see if that makes you happier. Now, you may want to do this on your own time, but do you want to spend \$500,000 of taxpayer money when we are a trillion dollars short?

This stuff has been going on with the National Science Foundation since the 1970s. William Proxmire was a Senator back in the 1970s—a conservative Democrat or a Democrat of some stripe. He used to do the Golden Fleece Award. Many of them went to the National Science Foundation around 1972. He

complained about it for 10 years before he retired. I have been complaining about it for 6 years.

What do the Republicans and Democrats do? They say: Oh, it is science. You wouldn't know, sir, about science. We have to give them more money. You are not smart enough to know there is a lot of science in taking selfies. We could learn something really important, and it is so important for the future of mankind to learn whether selfies of people smiling will help the world in the end.

NIH. Everybody loves the NIH. They can do no wrong. NIH did a \$2 million study to see whether, if you are following somebody in the cafeteria line and the guy or woman in front of you sneezes on the food, you are more or less likely to take the food. Really? I think we could have polled the audience on that. I mean, how ridiculous is that? Money like that—particularly when there are things the government needs to do. There is a trillion-dollar deficit, and we spend \$2 million studying what your reaction is to people sneezing on the food?

Then \$356,000 of your money was spent studying whether Japanese quail are more sexually promiscuous on cocaine. These guys have some great studies. This is, once again, I believe, the National Science Foundation. Hurray for the National Science Foundation. I know I am going to get hate mail from them. They spent \$356,000 to study whether Japanese quail are more sexually promiscuous on cocaine. You can't make this stuff up.

The reform I have proposed is that we have a taxpayer advocate on the committee to determine who gets these grants. Do you know what they say? We can't have any nonscientists. They wouldn't understand the science. I want the scientist who did this to come forward and explain why we need this study. There is no point to us spending this money. There could have been something better.

I offered one thing to try to fix it. Put a taxpayer advocate on the committee approving grants, and I think we should have a scientist who isn't in that field. This is sort of behavioral science for Japanese quail, I guess. We need to have somebody who studies diabetes, heart disease, cancer, AIDS—some of the diseases that affect more people. They need to be on the committee because they need to be scratching their heads saying: We can spend it on Japanese quail and their sexual habits or we can spend it on diabetes. The taxpayer advocate could say: We can spend it on Japanese quail or maybe we can reduce the debt. Maybe both could happen. Maybe we could reduce the debt and try to do only better scientific projects.

This one looks like something you really want your government to spend money on. They spent \$150,000 to investigate supernatural events in Alaska. They can look at unexplained lights, animals with transformative powers,

all kinds of different mythological animals, landscape features that had special powers, and, of course, you wouldn't want to leave out sea monsters. People say: What is \$150,000? That is the problem with government. Milton Friedman had it right when he said: "Nobody spends somebody else's money as wisely as he spends his own." Why does nobody care about the \$150,000? Because it wasn't their money to spend. This is the problem with government at-large and why the government is never good at anything they do. They are terribly ineffective because they are spending somebody else's money.

Government should be so small that they have less room to make errors like this. We should devolve most of the power of this place back to the States. That is what our Founding Fathers intended, and we should try to say we are not going to tolerate this kind of stuff.

This \$250,000 was spent to send 24 kids from Pakistan to Space Camp and Dollywood. My first question would be: Is there anybody in America who didn't get to go to Dollywood or Space Camp last year? I think when everybody in America has gone, we might consider sending some Pakistani kids. Frankly, there is nothing in the Constitution that says we should be sending Pakistani kids to Dollywood. There is nothing wrong if you want to send your kids from Pakistan to Dollywood—by all means. You should not take taxpayer money to do things like this.

May I ask the Presiding Officer how much time I have remaining of my 45 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). There is 19 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Thank you.

This is here in Washington, about a mile from here. We call it a "Streetcar Named Waste." Spending \$1.6 million to study the expansion of the DC streetcar—and this is a streetcar that nobody is actually riding on. It is a ghost car. Nobody is riding on it. It goes nowhere. It goes about a mile, from nowhere to nowhere, and is much slower than walking. I walked, and I can outwalk it. We thought about filming me in a race with the streetcar to see who wins, me walking or it driving; once again, going back to some technology from hundreds of years ago that still requires wires to be running down the street, and it is really not a useful expense of government money. DC gets a lot of Federal money.

Where else do they spend your money? This is one of my favorites. I just can't even imagine who spent this money. When I tell you, you will say: Certainly, that person was fired. No way. He works for the Federal Government. Nobody is ever fired in the Federal Government. They spent \$700,000 to study what Neil Armstrong said when he landed on the Moon. Did he say, "One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind," or did he say, "One small step for a man"? They wanted to

study whether the preposition “a” was mentioned by Neil Armstrong or whether he said: “One small step for man.” Where did the money come from? The grant was originally supposed to be for autism. We can debate whether the Federal Government should be involved in that. It sounds like a much more just study if it had something to do with autism than studying Neil Armstrong’s statement on the Moon.

You can’t make this stuff up. This is incredibly ridiculous, but it should be insulting. There should not be a taxpayer at home in America who says: All right. Today they are going to vote on a budget to cut one penny out of every dollar. We spent \$700,000 on what Neil Armstrong did or did not say on the Moon. You know what their conclusion at the end was? They don’t know. It is inconclusive. They listened to the tape over and over again. Someone should be fired.

It also should be a message to our body that we should cut some spending. Instead, we have done the opposite. Under Republican control of the Senate and the House, we busted the budget caps by \$300 billion just 2 months ago. Part of what my plan would do would be to restore the caps. They are put in place for a reason, to try to control our proclivity to spend too much money. We put the budget caps in place, then we cut 1 percent a year—about \$30 billion every year for 5 years, and then the government would begin to grow again at about 1 percent.

I know we could live within our means. What would happen is this guy would be fired, and that kind of study would not happen when they have 1 percent less. Maybe a program like the National Science Foundation would get 50 percent less or 75 percent less to really put them on notice that we are tired, after 30 years of crazy research, of them continuing without reform.

This was also spent in Afghanistan. This is your money. They used \$850,000 to set up a televised cricket league. The first problem is, most people don’t have TVs in Afghanistan. Really, a televised cricket league? They don’t even have TVs to watch it on. This is \$850,000 to make them feel better about their National Cricket League. Boondoggle. It has nothing to do with national defense. It makes us weaker by putting us further into debt.

Will this get better if we continue to increase money? No, it only gets worse. If you give them more money, they will spend it. In fact, we have studied spending at the end of the year. When you get to the end of the year, the government spends money four to five times faster than any other month in the year. The last 30 days of the fiscal year spending increases every day. In fact, on the last day of the fiscal year, you can watch spending accelerate as the Sun sets in the West. As offices begin to close in the East, the spending shifts to the Midwest. As the Sun sets farther in the western sky and the of-

fices are still open in California, they are spending money as fast as they can. If they don’t spend it, they will not get it next year—use it or lose it.

It is a phenomenon of government that has been going on forever. This kind of stuff happens. As long as you give them more money, they will do it. As long as they are rewarded for doing the spending, we should study which agencies do it. We should study which agencies go to Las Vegas and have their conference there for a million dollars, sipping champagne in a hot tub. That agency should get less money. I think those people actually did get fired—one of the few people ever fired.

We could have a debate on another occasion about climate change, but we probably agree that a \$450,000 app for your phone so you can play a climate change game that will, I guess, attempt to convince you and ensure that you are convinced that we are having climate change—\$450,000 for an app on a phone. Apps are everywhere. People are developing them all the time. Government doesn’t need to be spending \$450,000 for what somebody probably spends \$1,000 in their garage to develop.

Remember ObamaCare, when they tried to set up the website with millions of dollars, and then it failed? Remember the IRS just 3 weeks ago failing? We need to be very careful about giving government more money.

The budget I am introducing is called the penny plan budget. It cuts one penny out of every dollar. This is important for the country to see we are having this vote. They are not that excited to have this vote. We are only having this vote because the Senate rules basically mandate it. It can’t be avoided because Republicans didn’t create a budget. Democrats didn’t create a budget. So I decided, what the heck, I will create my own budget.

The penny plan budget has come forward. If we were to pass this, there are many good things. Through a simple majority, we could do many good things that conservative Republicans have wanted, like make the tax cuts permanent, and get rid of more regulations. We could do the REINS Act, which would say, new regulations that are very expensive have to be voted on by Congress. We should cut out more waste. There are all kinds of things we could do.

What we have chosen to do in our budget is actually give instructions to expand health savings accounts. One of the big problems we have in healthcare is rising costs. Costs are going up about 25 percent a year. The answer around here has been, I think, lame, uneducated, ill-informed, and counterproductive. Other than that, they are right on target. What they are trying to say is: Oh, your individual rates are going up 25 percent a year. Here is some money so you can pay for it. It does nothing to bring the curve down. It may accelerate the curve. If you subsidize something, it will become more

expensive. You are subsidizing the demand for it. We ought to expand health savings accounts where people pay for their healthcare. People say: I don’t want to pay for my healthcare. When you pay—when you have skin in the game—you ask the price of things. When the government pays or somebody else pays, you don’t ask the price of things, and the price rises.

Competition is the fundamental aspect of capitalism, but you have to have freely fluctuating prices, which we don’t in Medicare, Medicaid, and actually mostly private insurance. We have never really adjusted the fundamental problem of healthcare, which is that we don’t have capitalism in healthcare.

What do we do? Because we don’t have enough capitalism, we take more capitalism away and add more government, and it is more broken since we have done Obamacare. One of the answers—since many Republicans will not vote to repeal ObamaCare—is let us try to start expanding the marketplace.

My budget today could pass if every Republican voted for it. If it passes, we could move on to doing something like expanding the health savings accounts. This gets to an argument that is an inside baseball argument that happens in Washington. They will tell you: Young man, you must vote for our budget because the budget is simply a vehicle to do other good things. I look back at him and say: If it is a vehicle, and you don’t care what is in it, why not put something good in it? We always put something crappy in it that never works, never balances, and does not represent who we are as a party. They shove it down our throat and say: Vote for it. You have to do it because that is the only way to get to a tax cut. That is the only way we get to repeal ObamaCare, although they are not really for that anymore. But the thing is, they can do it by voting for something they actually are for. Everyone in our caucus is for the balanced budget amendment. If we put it forward on the floor, they will all vote for it, but there will not be enough votes for it to be law, so it is a free vote. This would be the actual platform, the actual symbol of what we run on and what we do next year. Yet we will not have a chance to do that unless they are willing to do it.

They want the budget to be meaningless. They want it to be a vehicle, but then they want it to be their meaningless symbol, and I can’t do that. I think there has to be someone left in the Republican Party who says enough is enough. We are not going to not tolerate the waste, spending, and debt, and we are going to say the same things we said to President Obama: Big government spending and debt are wrong.

I don’t think we should change this because we are in power. When the Republican Party is out of power, they are the conservative party. But the

problem is, when the Republican Party is in power, there is no conservative party. What I am arguing for today is that we should be who we say we are. I urge a “yes” vote on the penny plan budget.

Madam President, I will reserve the remainder of my time if I can get an update of what I have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 9 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Perfect. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PAUL. I will reserve the bulk of my time that is remaining and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to use leader time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Madam President.

Before I get into the substance of my remarks, I always listen diligently to my friend from Kentucky. There is a number that is missing in his charts; it is 1.5 trillion. The reason we don't like government spending is—he thinks—a lot of it is wasteful, but, ultimately, the reason is also that there is a huge deficit.

Our side scratches our heads not only with our friend from Kentucky, but with everyone on the other side who rails about too much government spending and creation of the deficit when they created the deepest hole they could have with the tax break that could have been paid for by closing loopholes. A group—a bipartisan group—had put something together that would have reduced the corporate rate to 25 percent, brought the money from overseas at 8, 9 percent, increased the child tax credit, left the individual side alone, and would have barely increased the deficit. So our side, at least, rankles when we hear these budgets that relate to deficit spending when, on the tax side, that doesn't seem to apply at all.

I say that with due respect to my good friend, who I know is sincere in his beliefs. He will argue with me that cutting taxes increases the economy. I would say that spending money on education and infrastructure also increases the economy. It is a slippery slope once you say: We can cut all the taxes we want; the deficit doesn't matter. It would be like our side saying: You can spend all the money you want; the deficit doesn't matter. We don't quite say that.

I thank my friend.

NET NEUTRALITY

Madam President, yesterday was a good day for the future of the internet. Democrats forced the Senate to take an important step closer to restoring net neutrality. It is another step closer to ensuring that large internet service providers don't get to hold all the cards, another step closer to protecting equality of access to the internet. In doing so, Senate Democrats stood with the 86 percent of Americans who oppose the repeal of net neutrality.

I am proud to say that Senator MARKEY's Congressional Review Act resolution passed yesterday afternoon with the votes of every single Democrat, as well as three of our Republican colleagues. I thank Senators COLLINS, MURKOWSKI, and KENNEDY for supporting this fine legislation.

Here is what my friend the Republican Senator from Louisiana had to say after the vote:

If you trust your cable company, you won't like my vote. If you don't trust your cable company, you will like my vote.

He is right. It is that simple. So you have to wonder why 47 Republicans voted no yesterday. Do they trust the cable companies and the large ISPs to do what is level best for the average American family? Do they believe that cable companies are really popular with the American people? I don't think so.

Now Republicans in the House have to take up this bipartisan resolution. We hope they will.

This isn't some partisan stunt. Absolutely not. It is a real, bipartisan effort to right the FCC's wrong and protect the free and open internet. It is very crucial to the future of the country.

House Republicans don't have to choose the same path that the vast majority of Republicans in the Senate decided to follow. Speaker RYAN should bring this up for a vote immediately. The American people have spoken. The Senate has spoken. Speaker RYAN should listen and bring the net neutrality CRA to the floor of the House.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Madam President, 1 year ago, former FBI Director Robert Mueller was appointed to lead the FBI's investigation into Russia's interference in the 2016 election. Of course, the investigation began long before that. According to the New York Times, it began in the middle of 2016 as a result of information we received from the Australian Ambassador, who told the FBI that Russian intelligence was working to share information with the Trump campaign.

At that time, we heard a lot about the FBI's investigation of Hillary Clinton's emails, but remarkably, we heard nothing about this other investigation. Now we know that one of those two investigations is much more serious than the other one was. We also know that if it were a witch hunt—as the President seems to think it is—if they were out

to get him, they certainly would have leaked information about that during the election campaign. They didn't.

The probe led by Special Counsel Mueller, a Republican and decorated marine veteran, concerns the campaign of a hostile foreign power to interfere in and influence the outcome of an American election. There is nothing—nothing—more serious to the integrity of a democracy than the guarantee of free and fair elections.

The Founding Fathers warned about foreign interference. When I used to read that clause in high school, I said: What do they mean? That is not going to happen. Well, they were a lot smarter than we are—as always. They knew this danger. Here it is, 2018, and we see how real it is. It is the core of the special counsel's investigation.

The investigation has already yielded multiple indictments and guilty pleas. Yesterday the Senate Intelligence Committee, in a bipartisan manner, confirmed that Russia sought to interfere with our elections, sow discord, and tip the scales toward Donald Trump and against Secretary Clinton. The Trump administration itself has even taken punitive action against Russia's actors named in Mueller's investigation.

I salute the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, the Republican Senator from North Carolina, for being straightforward about this. Not so many on the other side of the aisle are.

Yet, again this morning, President Trump called the investigation a “disturbing, illegal, and unwarranted witch hunt . . . the greatest witch hunt in American history.” The rhetoric this man uses is amazing.

I say to the President: It is not a witch hunt when 17 Russians have been indicted. It is not a witch hunt when some of the most senior members of the Trump campaign have been indicted. It is not a witch hunt when Democrats and Republicans agree with the intelligence community that Russia interfered in our election to aid President Trump.

Any fair-minded citizen, even the most ardent partisan, should be able to look at the facts and say that this investigation is not a witch hunt. The FBI Director, Christopher Wray, appointed by President Trump, a Republican, said as much yesterday.

Truly, we should all be aghast, on this 1-year anniversary of Mueller's appointment, at the smear campaign by the President and his allies. We should all be aghast at the relentless parade of conspiracies manufactured by the most extreme elements of the Republican Party and conservative media to distract from the special counsel's investigation. From “deep state” leaks to unmasking requests, phone taps at Trump Tower, Uranium One, Nunes's midnight run to the White House, and the Nunes memo—these are all attempts to derail a legitimate and important investigation.

Now House conservatives are badgering DOJ officials for classified documents, hunting desperately for any scrap of information that would help them sully the investigation. By the way, for all of their ranting and raving and interfering, they don't have a scintilla of evidence to support that this is a witch hunt, that this is unfair, or that this is politically motivated.

The President and his allies don't quit with all these conspiracy theories, with all these ridiculous fomentations. Frankly, it is because they are afraid of what Mueller's investigation will reveal.

Every American who looks at the President's actions says that he is afraid of what the Mueller investigation will reveal. Yet the volume of mistruth, the weight of all the distortion and fabrication is hurting our democracy.

The double standard is enormous. The Times article shows no leaks when Trump was under investigation during the campaign; obviously, it was made public when Hillary Clinton was. Again, if this were a witch hunt, why didn't the FBI, which the President seems to feel is politically motivated with no scintilla of proof—why wouldn't they leak it?

One more point before I leave the floor—yesterday, the words of former Secretary Tillerson were these: “If our leaders seek to conceal the truth or we as a people become accepting of alternative realities that are no longer grounded in facts, then we as American citizens are on the pathway to relinquishing our freedom.”

He is exactly right. When distortion, lies, and intimidation come repeatedly from the other side and some conservative news media, and that becomes the accepted way, when it is just he said, she said, where one side is blatantly lying, and that becomes accepted, our democracy is at risk.

We are a beautiful thing here—founded on facts, real facts. What we have seen from the President and some of his allies, the way they are behaving, makes you worry about the future of this democracy.

Ultimately, I have a firm belief that they will not succeed. The Founding Fathers were geniuses—geniuses—when they set up a system of checks and balances that we read about in our classes and we study, but it is almost mystical. It always rises to the occasion. It will again, despite the efforts of the President, despite the efforts of some of his allies who have gone way overboard; I might mention Chairman NUNES on the other side. I believe the checks and balances of this country will hold, and we will eventually find out the truth, no matter where it leads.

Today is a good day to remember that the special counsel's investigation is serious, it is nonpartisan, and it is critical to the integrity of our democracy. We must allow it to proceed without political interference, without intimidation, to follow all the facts in

pursuit of the unvarnished truth on such an important issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2872

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2872) to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to reform the procedures provided under such Act for the initiation, investigation, and resolution of claims alleging that employing offices of the legislative branch have violated the rights and protections provided to their employees under such Act, including protections against sexual harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, 100 days ago, the House of Representatives voted unanimously to pass the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, the bill that would fix the way we deal with sexual harassment and discrimination here in Congress.

The current system is broken. It makes no sense that a staffer who is sexually harassed or discriminated against has to possibly wait months for mediation, for counseling, or for a cooling off before she or he is able to even file a claim.

This bill would also make sure that when a Member of Congress has sexually harassed or discriminated against someone on their staff, the taxpayers are not left holding the bag. That is what the bill does. There is no reasonable excuse for anyone to stand in the way.

Our constituents do not deserve to have their hard-earned dollars paying for these settlements. What they deserve is a vote on this reform now. But what have we seen since the House acted? Nothing but politics as usual, despite having significant bipartisan support on this issue.

I thank my colleagues—Minority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and Senator MURRAY—for their strong leadership on this issue and all of their efforts to pass this bill in the Senate. They have been great partners in trying to move this forward.

It is long since time that we should be acting on this issue. We need to pass this bill and send it to the President's desk so he can sign it into law, because what we have seen so clearly, after the several months and years that we have

been talking about this, is that sexual harassment and discrimination in the workplace is far more pervasive and egregious than we previously might have recognized.

We have all witnessed harassment and discrimination. We all see what it actually does to society—whether it is happening in factories, in restaurants, in Hollywood, in the Halls of Congress, or right here in this building. But the difference is that while practically every other industry in the country seems to be taking this issue far more seriously and at least trying to make an effort to change their workplaces, Congress is dragging its feet.

Once again, a problem is staring us right in the face, and we are looking the other way. Enough is enough. We should do better. We have waited 100 days, and we should not have to wait any longer.

So I urge my colleagues to do the right thing now, to support this bill. Fix this system here in Congress that is failing our staffers on this issue of sexual harassment. This one is as easy as it gets. So let's have a vote and let's pass it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I appreciate being recognized. I am going to talk about a budget proposal by my colleague from Kentucky, Senator PAUL.

To those who want to balance our budget and get us out of debt, count me in. How do we do that? I would like to do it without destroying the military. I would like not to open up the wound when it comes to the effects of sequestration.

Unfortunately, Senator PAUL's approach is devastating to the military. It creates unpredictability at a time when we need predictability. It throws us back into the old system where nobody knows what is going to happen.

Let me tell you about how you balance the budget and get us out of debt.

In 2008, this blue line represents discretionary spending. This is about 30 percent of overall Federal spending. You can see that from 2008 to 2028 it has been relatively flat. In the budget agreement we entered into just a few weeks ago, we are spending less on non-defense discretionary spending by \$2 billion than we did in 2010. This red line represents about the 65 to 70 percent of Federal spending called entitlements, and it is going through the roof. So if you want to balance the budget, you have to deal with the red line. You can't take it all out of the blue line.

Sequestration has taken about \$1 trillion out of the military. I compliment President Trump for entering into a budget agreement that will restore funding to the military at a time when we need it the most.

What did sequestration do to the military? According to Secretary Mattis, “no enemy in the field has done more to harm the combat readiness of

our military than sequestration." What a stunning statement that is. In other words, Congress has sunk more ships, shot down more planes, and taken more soldiers off the battlefield than any enemy.

Under sequestration, we are at the smallest level for the Navy since 1915, the smallest Army since 1940, and the smallest Air Force in modern history. That is about to change with the budget agreement—\$700 billion for the military to retool, to buy new equipment, to have more people so that our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines can spend a little bit of time with their families instead of being deployed all the time. So I applaud Senator PAUL's zeal to balance the budget.

What I want to do is to expose what this budget actually does. If you are a defense hawk, you should be against this approach because it does the one thing we can't afford to do. It creates unpredictability when it comes to our national defense strategy.

At times like this, I miss Senator MCCAIN because I know he would be here with me.

Under this proposal, we are going to cut \$404.8 billion next year. How much comes out of defense? Well, we will figure that out later. We know \$6 billion has to come out of it, but it effectively sets aside the budget agreement that plussed up defense. Over the next decade, \$13.358 trillion will be cut. Of that, how much comes out of defense? Well, we will figure that out later.

Let me tell you what that means to the military: devastation. Here is what Secretary Mattis said on April 26 about predictability: We need predictability so that we can actually put a strategy into effect. If you do not have a budget that reflects the strategy, it does not work.

Under the budget agreement, we have predictability for the next couple of years. We are restoring the cuts, and we have to build on what we have done in the next 2 years through the next 10 years.

What does this budget proposal do? It destroys predictability. It requires \$404.8 billion, and it doesn't tell the Department of Defense how much they are going to have to pay. We know \$6 billion.

Here is what I would suggest. If the past is any indication of the future, our friends on the other side are not going to let us exempt defense. Sequestration was half out of defense, half out of non-defense, and left entitlements pretty much alone.

Senator PAUL says we are not going to deal with Social Security. Social Security is going broke. Somebody needs to deal with it. Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill dealt with it by adjusting the age of retirement to save Social Security benefits. So when you take Social Security off the table—and let's say, magically, that everybody agreed with me that we should not undercut the defense budget, that we should actually add to it and give predictability—how

do you get \$13 trillion if you take Social Security and defense off the table? Well, we won't because you can't.

So to those who claim to be defense hawks—which I proudly claim to be—this is a symbolic vote. Yes, the symbolism here is that we don't care about predictability when it comes to defense spending, that we are undercutting the agreement we achieved just a month ago to give the military the funds they need to defend this Nation.

Now, if you live in a world where the military is small and we don't have any troops deployed anywhere, this might work. On September 10, 2001, we didn't have one soldier in Afghanistan. We didn't have an embassy, and not one dime in foreign aid went to Afghanistan. The next day, we got attacked, coming from Afghanistan, because radical Islam will not leave you alone just because you want to leave them alone.

President Trump is right to rebuild the military. He campaigned on setting aside sequestration. It was dumb. It hollowed out our force. It has been a nightmare for our military. Planes have been falling out of the sky.

What does this budget do? It puts us back into a level of unpredictability. It requires \$404 billion out of the 2019 budget. It says that \$6 billion has to come from defense. After that, we don't know.

Here is what I know. It is going to undercut everything we have done to provide predictability. At the end of the day, this budget puts everything every defense person has been hoping for in jeopardy. It takes the efforts of President Trump to rebuild the military and throws it in a ditch, because if you take Social Security off the table, if you took defense off the table, then you can't get there from here. Do you want to destroy the FBI, the CIA, the Department of Justice, the NIH?

This is a symbolic statement. These budgets usually don't get many votes. I am tired of symbolism at the expense of our fighting men and women.

Here is my message. I will engage in entitlement reform. Senator PAUL had an entitlement reform bill for Medicare. I joined with him. As for Social Security, to my friends on the other side, let's do something like Simpson-Bowles. Let's go ahead and find a way to do entitlement reform and deal with the discretionary budget, not in a haphazard guessing kind of way.

Count me in for wanting to balance the budget, but you have to go where the money is. You have to do what Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill did. We have to do things for Medicare like the Gang of Six, Simpson-Bowles. What I will not symbolically lend my vote to is an approach to balance the budget that doesn't give you a clue about how much money we are going to spend on the military for the next decade. That, by its very nature, undercuts all of the gains we have achieved to rebuild the military, to throw the military budget to the wolves.

I can tell you this: \$404.8 billion is coming out of the fiscal year 2019 budget. If you believe we can do that without affecting the military, then the last 7 or 8 years seems not to have meant anything, because for the last 6 or 7 years we have been cutting the military a lot because of a budget agreement that everybody thought would never happen. Nobody believed that sequestration would actually hit, that we would do \$1 trillion over a decade. The sequestration clause was a penalty clause to urge people to get it right by putting the Defense Department at risk, with 50 percent of sequestration cuts coming out of defense. The reason they put it on the table is because they thought Congress wouldn't be dumb enough to actually get into sequestration. Guess what. We were that dumb. According to General Mattis, we have done more damage to the military than any enemy in the field since 9/11—what a title to claim as a Congress.

This budget throws us back into that situation on steroids. So, symbolically, I stand for balancing the budget, doing it in a responsible way that has entitlement reform as the heart of the effort in a bipartisan fashion.

Symbolically, I will not vote for a budget that does not give the Department of Defense the resources they need and the predictability they need to protect this country. That is what this budget does.

So to those of us on the Armed Services Committee, you should know better. You should know that of the \$13.5 trillion being cut over the next decade, a lot of it is going to come out of defense if it actually was a reality. If you take defense and Social Security off the table, it is a joke. Now is not the time to be funny. Now is the time to be serious. I am deadly serious about voting against any budget that doesn't give the military the predictability they need to defend this Nation. This budget throws our military in a ditch, and I am tired of doing that.

I am going to vote no. I urge everyone who cares about Defense Department funding and predictability to vote no. Balance the budget, yes. Throw the military to the wolves, no.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND HARASSMENT REFORM BILL

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I am pleased to be here on the floor in support of my colleague Senator GILLIBRAND's bill, the Congressional Accountability and Harassment Reform Act. I am pleased that so many Members of the Senate have supported the earlier version of the bill and are signing up to support this version as well.

It has been 100 days since the House acted on a significant and substantive reform of the process here in Congress on how we address sexual harassment. There have been plenty of stories about how unacceptable the current system is.

In spite of how far women's rights and equality have come in America, too many women continue to face inequality, discrimination, and harassment day in and day out. Our congressional workplace is not immune to that.

The world is changing, and the world is changing quickly, and movements like the "me too." campaign are finally giving women the voice they need to stand up and say no more.

Yet, in spite of this tide of change, the Senate refuses to act on our unacceptably obscure, complex, and difficult system for staff members to address sexual harassment and discrimination—a system that is difficult to navigate and void of transparency. It needs to change. It must change. One hundred days ago, the House said absolutely it must change, and we have seen no bill allowed to come to the floor to address it in the Senate.

The House did its duty. They put forward a vision of updating and strengthening procedures to protect women from sexual harassment and to address it, should it occur. Now it is time for the Senate to act, to hold ourselves to a much higher standard, to lead by example on Capitol Hill and for the rest of the Nation, to give those who work on our team who have been victimized by sexual harassment or discrimination a fair and transparent process to tell their stories, to pursue justice, to be free from the fear of professional or political retribution. That is exactly what the Congressional Accountability and Harassment Reform Act does. It requires sexual harassment awareness training. It simplifies a process for staffers to file complaints. It eliminates a mandatory, laborious process of required counseling and mediation. It protects a victim's option to publicly discuss their claims. It prohibits members found responsible for such behavior from using government funds—their office funds—to settle the claims, and it requires all settlements to be disclosed publicly unless the victim prefers otherwise. No longer would we be able to silence the victims or hide the misdeeds of the perpetrators from the American people.

I understand Members on the floor of the Senate may say: I want to hide from my actions; I want to pay off any settlement with my government funds, but being able to hide from your actions is unacceptable, and using government funds to pay off the situation is completely unacceptable.

Action is way past due. I am glad to join with my colleagues Senator GILLIBRAND, Senator WARREN, Senator HARRIS, and Senator MURRAY—so many who have come into this battle of equality, fairness, and fighting for those who have been victimized. That is what this act is about, and it is not acceptable that for 100 days the leadership of this body has sat on this bill, blocking it from being considered.

Let us recognize that we have a responsibility to our team members for

fairness, for transparency, and for accountability and to bring this bill to the floor immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULIVAN). The Senator from Massachusetts.

NOMINATION OF GINA HASPEL

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I am here to express my strong opposition to President Trump's nomination of Gina Haspel to be the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. There are two reasons I oppose this nomination: Ms. Haspel's support for torture and her willingness to destroy evidence of the CIA's use of torture.

For years, apologists for the CIA's program have tried to redescribe this inhumane practice to make it seem less appalling to the American people. They have even renamed it. Torture has been rebranded as "enhanced interrogation."

There is no way to hide the basic facts. The techniques used by the CIA were torture: waterboarding so the person had the repeated sensation of drowning, confining people to small boxes for hours on end, depriving people of sleep for days, forcing people to hold painful stress positions.

The CIA did not invent these tactics. Listen to an American war hero describe what he endured as a prisoner of war in Vietnam.

I was being forced to stand up continuously—sometimes they'd make you stand up or sit on a stool for a long period of time. I'd stood up for a couple of days, with a respite only because one of the guards—the only real human being that I ever met over there—let me lie down for a couple of hours while he was on watch in the middle of one night.

Speaking about his captors, this former American POW said:

They bounced me from pillar to post, kicking and laughing and scratching. After a few hours of that, ropes were put on me and I sat that night bound with ropes.

They beat me around a little bit. I was in such bad shape that when they hit me it would knock me unconscious. They kept saying, "You will not receive any medical treatment until you talk."

I was getting about three or four spoonfuls of food twice a day. Sometimes I'd go for a day or so without eating.

I had learned what we all learned over there: Every man has his breaking point. I had reached mine. . . . I had been reduced to an animal during this period of beating and torture.

These are the words of Senator JOHN MCCAIN—our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona, a decorated Naval aviator who was beaten, broken, and tortured for 2 years after being captured in North Vietnam.

No matter how you dress it up, torture is torture, and it is wrong. It is inhumane, it is infective, and it is un-American.

That was the conclusion of the 2014 Senate Intelligence Committee report on the CIA's Detention and Interrogation Program during the Bush administration. The committee drew a definitive conclusion: Torture did not work. In fact, not only does torture not work, it makes it more difficult for other

agencies in our government to protect our national security.

Surely a person who is seeking to be the Director of the CIA in 2018 should agree with this assessment or be able to give a really good explanation of why not. Someone seeking to be the Director of the CIA should be able to state clearly that torture is wrong, but when repeatedly asked a yes-or-no question by my colleague Senator KAMALA HARRIS: Were the CIA's actions immoral, Ms. Haspel danced around the answer. These are not the answers of a person who can be trusted to administer the powerful CIA.

That question of trust goes to my second objection: The Director of the CIA will make many decisions that will be held in secret and never reviewed by the American people. It is critical we trust her judgment and that we have complete confidence in her honesty and willingness to submit to congressional oversight. I do not have that confidence in Ms. Haspel, and here is why. As we now know from the public reports, between October and December of 2002, Ms. Haspel oversaw a CIA prison in Thailand. Under her leadership, at least one detainee was waterboarded and subjected to other torture methods. As far as we know, Ms. Haspel raised no objections.

According to news reports, in 2005, Ms. Haspel recommended that the CIA destroy 92 videotapes of interrogations of detainees. CIA officials remember, at the time, Ms. Haspel was one of "the staunchest advocates inside the building for destroying the tapes"—"the staunchest advocates inside the building for destroying the tapes." She went so far as to draft the order for her boss, the Director of the National Clandestine Service, to sign, urging them to use "an industrial strength shredder," just to make sure they were completely destroyed.

Ms. Haspel destroyed these tapes despite Federal court orders requiring the preservation of the CIA's records, despite the objections of Members of Congress, and against the order of the Director of National Intelligence, the CIA Director, two White House Counsels, and senior Department of Justice officials. In a convenient coincidence for Ms. Haspel, the tapes she ordered destroyed reportedly documented the interrogation of detainees at the very same CIA prison in Thailand that Ms. Haspel previously supervised. Even more conveniently, some of the tapes reportedly documented the interrogation of the very detainee who was waterboarded under Ms. Haspel's leadership.

When Senator ANGUS KING asked about her destruction of the tapes, Ms. Haspel could come up with no credible explanation. How can we trust her to be fully forthright with Congress in the future if she cannot acknowledge missteps of the past?

Ms. Haspel had numerous opportunities to question the directives she was given during this era. According to the

Senate Intelligence Committee report, other CIA officers regularly called into question the effectiveness and safety of the techniques being used but not Gina Haspel. It was happening right before her eyes, and she did nothing to stop it. While her colleagues questioned the legitimacy of the CIA's program, according to public reports, Ms. Haspel vigorously defended it. According to those same reports, the Trump White House reviewed CIA message logs that "made it clear just how accepting she had been of since disavowed interrogation techniques."

The fact is, so far as the record indicates, the only action Ms. Haspel has taken with regard to U.S. torture practices has been to do her best to cover it up.

Why relitigate the choices that were made during those dark days after 9/11? Because this matters, especially with a President like Donald Trump. As a candidate, Donald Trump said he would "bring back a hell of a lot worse than waterboarding" because even "if it doesn't work, they deserve it anyway." As President, Donald Trump pulled back from his plan to reinstate the use of secret CIA prisons overseas only after overwhelming bipartisan outrage.

The stakes are high. The use of torture is one of the darkest chapters in our Nation's modern history. We cannot give this President any reason to drag this country back. We cannot allow any room for that mistake to occur again.

Gina Haspel has spent 33 years at the CIA. She has a decorated career and has sacrificed for this country in many ways Americans will never know. I have no doubt her current and former colleagues who praise her as a patriot are sincere, but patriotism and judgment are not the same thing. Someone who puts protecting the Agency above following the law cannot be trusted.

When announcing his opposition to Gina Haspel's nomination, Senator McCAIN recently said that "the methods we employ to keep our nation safe must be as right and just as the values we aspire to live up to and promote in the world." I agree with Senator McCAIN, and I urge my colleagues to reject her nomination.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. President, I rise to honor the lives of six Massachusetts police officers who lost their lives in the line of duty. On April 12, our Commonwealth suffered a terrible loss when Sergeant Sean Gannon of the Yarmouth Police Department was killed while serving an arrest warrant. He was only 32 years old.

A native of New Bedford, MA, Sergeant Gannon graduated from Bishop Stang High School in North Dartmouth and then earned a bachelor's degree in criminal justice from Westfield State University and a master's in emergency management from the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

After college, Sergeant Gannon jumped headfirst into public service,

first serving as a public safety officer and later becoming a police officer with the Yarmouth Police Department, where he served for 8 years. Sergeant Gannon loved working with police dogs, and he was the first full-time K-9 narcotics officer at the Yarmouth PD. His loyal patrol dog, Near-Oh, was seriously injured in the incident that claimed Sergeant Gannon's life, but he is expected to recover and return to the Gannon family.

Sergeant Gannon had a huge heart and spent his free time volunteering with Big Brothers, Big Sisters, traveling, enjoying the outdoors, and working with his hands.

Thousands of mourners, including law enforcement officials from across the country, gathered to pay their respects at Sergeant Gannon's wake—a testament to the high esteem with which his community held him and to the power of his sacrifice.

Yarmouth police chief Frank Frederickson calls Sergeant Gannon the "Tom Brady of our department" and posthumously promoted him to the rank of sergeant.

Last month, I spoke with Sergeant Gannon's wife, Dara, and his parents, Patrick and Denise, to offer my condolences, my thoughts, and my prayers, and I continue to hold them in my heart.

Next year, Sergeant Gannon's name will be added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, recognizing law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice in service to their communities. We owe Sergeant Gannon and all of them a deep debt of gratitude. They died as heroes.

I would also like to recognize the five Massachusetts officers whose names were added to the memorial this year. Patrolman Seth A. Noyes, of the Boston Police Department, died on October 18, 1870, from injuries sustained in the line of duty. He was 41 years old. Sergeant John J. Shanahan, of the Revere Police Department, died on November 19, 1928, when he was hit by a truck while directing traffic around the scene of a car accident. He was 54 years old. Patrolman Jeremiah J. O'Connor, of the Lawrence Police Department, died on November 14, 1950, when he had a heart attack after pursuing a subject. He was 61 years old. Patrolman Frederick A. Bell, of the Newton Police Department, died on September 5, 1954, 4 months after he suffered severe injuries in a car crash. He was 39 years old. Sergeant Raymond P. Cimino, of the Chelsea Police Department, died on February 28, 1985, after suffering a heart attack. He was 44 years old.

We honor their service, we honor their sacrifice, and most importantly, we honor the lives they led and the legacies they leave behind.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this morning we will be voting on a budget resolution written by my Republican

colleague Senator RAND PAUL from Kentucky.

This is a budget that would lead to devastating cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and education, while paving the way for even more tax breaks to the top 1 percent and large, profitable corporations.

Make no mistake about it: Senator PAUL's budget is an immoral budget. It is bad economic policy. While I am confident that this resolution will be defeated in the Senate, let me be very clear.

Senator PAUL's vision of America—balancing the budget on the backs of working families, the elderly, the sick, the children, and the poor in order to make the richest people in America even richer—is the exact same vision of the Republican Party in the House and the Republican Party in Washington, DC.

So let me commend Senator PAUL for being honest with the American people in terms of what he believes and for putting down on paper what a majority of Republicans in the House and billionaire campaign contributors like the Koch brothers and Sheldon Adelson believe.

And this is what they want.

At a time of massive wealth and income inequality, Senator PAUL and the Republicans in the House do not believe that it was good enough to provide over \$1 trillion in tax breaks to the wealthiest people and most profitable corporations. The budget that we are debating today would give the wealthy and the powerful an even bigger tax break.

Last year, the congressional leadership came up with a bill to throw 32 million Americans off of health insurance. Senator PAUL and many Republicans in the House do not believe that bill went far enough. The budget we are debating today would throw up to 45 million Americans off of Medicaid.

A few months ago, President Trump proposed a budget calling for Medicare to be cut by nearly \$500 billion. Senator PAUL and a majority of Republicans do not believe those cuts went far enough. The budget we are debating today would cut Medicare by up to \$3.3 trillion over the next decade.

At a time when 10,000 people die each and every year waiting for their Social Security disability benefits to be processed, Donald Trump's budget proposed making a bad situation even worse by cutting the Social Security Disability Insurance Program.

Senator PAUL and a majority of Republicans do not believe that those cuts went far enough. The Paul budget would not only cut Social Security for the disabled, his budget would cut the entire Social Security program by \$442 billion over the next decade compared to current law.

Overall, Senator PAUL's resolution calls for slashing the budget by more than 51 percent by the end of the decade.

Not too long ago, if someone proposed ending Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid as we know it so

that billionaires could get a huge tax break, that would have been considered a radical and extreme agenda. Today it is the mainstream position of the Republican Party in Washington.

The reality is that Republicans in Washington have never believed in Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, Federal assistance in education, or providing any direct government assistance to those in need. They have always believed that tax breaks for the wealthy and the powerful would somehow miraculously trickle down to every American, despite all history and evidence to the contrary.

Needless to say, and I am only speaking for myself, I have a very different vision of America.

In my view, we need to create a government and an economy that works for all of us, not just a handful of billionaires.

What does that mean?

It means that instead of giving over a trillion dollars in tax breaks to the top 1 percent and large profitable corporations, we must demand that Wall Street, the billionaire class and large, profitable corporations start paying their fair share in taxes.

Instead of trying to abolish the estate tax, which impacts less than two-tenths of 1 percent, we must substantially increase the inheritance tax not only to bring in needed revenue, but to dismantle the oligarchs that now control so much of our economic and political lives.

Instead of making it easier for corporations to avoid paying U.S. taxes by stashing their cash in the Cayman Islands, we need to crack down on offshore tax haven abuse and use this revenue to create 15 million good-paying American jobs rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure.

Instead of cutting Social Security, we need to expand Social Security so that every American can retire with the dignity and the respect they deserve. We pay for that by making sure everyone who makes over \$250,000 a year pays the same percentage of their income into Social Security as the middle class.

Instead of cutting Medicare, we need to guarantee healthcare as a right to every man, woman, and child in America through a Medicare for all, single-payer healthcare program.

Instead of slashing Federal aid to education, we must make every public college and university in America tuition free, and we pay for that by imposing a tax on Wall Street speculation. If we could bail out Wall Street 10 years ago, we can tax Wall Street so that every American who has the desire and the ability can get a higher education regardless of their income.

Instead of listening to the Koch brothers, Sheldon Adelson, and other multibillionaire campaign contributors, it is time to start listening to the overwhelming majority of Americans who want a government and an economy that works for the many, not just the few.

Let us not only defeat the Paul resolution, but let us have the guts to take on the greed of Wall Street, the greed of the pharmaceutical and healthcare industry, the greed of Big Oil, and the greed of corporate America and break up the oligarchy that is destroying the social fabric of our society.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, shortly, we will be voting on the penny plan budget. This is a budget that cuts one penny out of every dollar.

As we have gone through time and again, we have seen that there is so much waste in government, from \$700,000 spent studying Neil Armstrong's statement on the Moon—did he say "one small step for man and one giant leap for mankind," or did he say "one small step for a man"? We spent \$700,000 trying to discover whether Neil Armstrong said "a man" or just "man." It is a complete boondoggle, a complete waste of money. But does it get better? No, because we keep giving people more money.

Some have come to the floor and said: Well, this is just an end-around attempt to cut military spending. We can't cut any military spending.

That is simply not true. The penny plan budget says nothing about cutting military spending. The penny plan budget says this: We cut 1 percent of the budgetary spending. Where it is cut in the budget is left up to the appropriations committees. It could be cut equally, or it could be cut more in some areas and less in other areas. We could cut some from military; we could cut zero from military. It is left up to the appropriators.

Some would argue: Well, it doesn't define where it would come from.

Well, that is the job of the appropriators and the job of the Senate to vote up or down on it.

To those who argue that unlimited spending for the military is good for our national security, they might want to think about whether there is a possible problem in that China has \$1 trillion worth of our debt.

Let's say for some reason there was a conflict in the South China Sea and we were somehow involved militarily there. What if China were to say: We are going to dump your dollars. We are going to dump your Treasury bills.

Could they wreak havoc, dumping \$1 trillion? Yes. Would it hurt their assets? Yes, but it could be used as a weapon against the United States.

Our insecurity is our enormous debt—\$21 trillion.

In some ways, the budget vote is symbolism, but the question is whether that symbolism will be who we are as a Republican Party or whether that symbolism will be that we are simply the same as the Democrats, that we simply don't care about the debt, we don't care that interest on the debt is the second biggest item.

After the Defense Department—about \$700 billion—the next biggest item is

\$300 billion in interest. What happens when interest rates rise? The Federal Reserve has artificially kept interest rates low. What about when interest rates go to 5 percent? Could that happen? Yes. Could it be precipitated by a foreign nation no longer buying our debt? Yes.

If interest rates were to go to 5 percent currently, I don't know that we would be able to manage our debt. That would probably be a doubling of our interest payment, or more—\$600 billion. If we do nothing and the Federal Reserve is able to keep our interest rates in the 2 percent range, interest rates will still be about the same as the Department of Defense within 10 years. The Department of Defense is about \$700 billion, and it will grow probably to \$800-and-some-odd billion, but interest rates will be \$761 billion within a decade. If that is not a threat to our national security, I don't know what is.

Really what we have is a threat to our honor as public servants who make promises to voters. We came to power in Washington because we said President Obama spent too much and borrowed too much. We said it over and over and over again until voters chose us. But what if, when we come into power, we forget who we are? When Republicans are in the minority, they are the conservative party. The problem is that when the Republicans become the majority, there is no conservative party.

What I am arguing for today is to cut one penny out of every dollar. There is waste from top to bottom in every department of government, including the military.

Defense Logistics—they build stuff. They have \$800 million they say is missing.

Defense spending or military spending in Afghanistan—\$700 million of ammunition missing. Do we think that might be a little bit worrisome given all the different characters in the Afghan civil war? There is \$700 million in ammunition that cannot be accounted for and \$28 million in uniforms that cannot be accounted for.

They built a \$45 million gas station in Afghanistan, but it is for natural gas. The first problem is that they don't have cars in Afghanistan. The second problem is that none of them run on natural gas. So how did we fix that problem? We bought them cars. We bought them cars that run on natural gas, and they still couldn't afford the gas, so we gave them credit cards. How moronic are we as a people to keep flushing money down a rat hole in Afghanistan—nearly \$50 billion.

What I am asking is that we cut 1 percent—1 penny out of every dollar.

Could we save some in the military? Absolutely. Is this done to punish the military? No. It is to make us stronger as a country. Could the military suffer a 1-percent cut and actually become more efficient? Absolutely. It is not a question of whether our military budget is too big or too small; it is a question of whether our military mission is

too large. We are at war in half a dozen countries or more. We have 6,000 troops in Africa, and I would suspect that there is not one person in 1,000 in America who knows whom we are fighting or why we are fighting in Africa.

But that is not really what this is about. It is about spending in every department of government. It is about whether one penny out of every dollar is being wasted.

People say: I am against the waste. I am against all the waste. I am against the study on Japanese quail to see if they are more sexually promiscuous on cocaine. I am against the Neal Armstrong study on whether he said one man on the Moon or just man on the Moon.

The thing is, we can't get rid of waste unless we actually reduce top-line spending because nobody has any incentive to do it.

When the sequester first came into place, even though people didn't like it, people throughout government began finding savings. You cannot get rid of waste in government if you keep giving people more money.

The National Science Foundation has wasted millions and millions of dollars over a 30-year history. William Proxmire first reported in the early 1970s, and he said that one of the first studies was \$50,000—back then, that was more money than it is now—to study why men like women. Really? That is a good use of taxpayer funds?

This year, we will spend \$1 trillion we don't have. There will be nearly a \$1 trillion deficit this year. That is what we complained about under President Obama, was big, annual \$1 trillion deficits. Are we going to be the party that is actually true to what we say we are for, that we are fiscally conservative? Can we not cut one penny out of every dollar?

So I implore my colleagues to think long and hard about this vote. Think about how the people at home would want you to vote. You have gone home and said you were for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. The balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, which virtually all of my Republican colleagues voted for, says we will balance the budget in 5 years. Well, we are either honest and serious or we are not. So if you can vote for a balanced budget amendment that balances the budget, why would you not vote for a budget that balances in 5 years?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. PAUL. I will finish in a few minutes.

It is a canard to say that the cut is coming from the military. The cut is a 1-percent cut. It is \$3.2 trillion spent, and it is \$32 billion that would be cut. Every year, we send \$30 billion to foreign countries that hate us. We spend nearly \$50 billion in Afghanistan every year. If we were simply looking at the

Department of Commerce—\$14 billion—and the Department of Education—\$70 billion—I think we could find \$30 billion that we would never know was gone.

The bottom line is whether the debt is threatening our national security, whether it is threatening the security of the economic foundation of our country, and I think without question it is.

This vote is a litmus test for conservatives. Are you a conservative? Do you think we could cut one penny out of every dollar? I think it is a conservative notion that we have long said we are for. Now it is time to step up to the plate and actually vote what you say you stand for.

With that, I yield back my time and ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a moment for a unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There does not appear to be a sufficient second at this time.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask to propound a unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask that I be recognized for 1 minute. No, I don't. I ask that I be recognized at the conclusion of this vote to explain why the Paul amendment would be damaging to our national security. That is my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, would it be appropriate at this time for me to ask for 1 minute prior to the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you very much.

I know the intentions are good; we have voted on the same thing for the last 5 years. I can tell you right now what the vote result is going to be because it has been the same for the last 5 years.

No one has had a more consistently conservative record than I have, but I would have to say that this would undo a lot of what we have accomplished with the last vote to allow us to start rebuilding our systems. We got in a position where we didn't have brigade combat teams that were adequately prepared to go to battle. Sixty percent of our F-18s were not flying. We are trying to recover from all of these things. We have now started that recovery.

My concern is—and I think Senator GRAHAM said it very well—in the event that we pass this—if it did pass; it won't, but if it did—that is going to be a problem and a problem that we can't overcome.

Right now, our No. 1 concern should be defending this Nation. This is the opportunity to at least let people know that there is a legitimate vote for conservatives to vote for a strong national defense.

I don't want to send a signal to our kids overseas—our kids in battles and in harm's way—that we are not going to take care of their needs, as we just started just a year ago to do. We have to continue that.

For the sake of our national security, I suggest that we vote against the Paul proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to S. Con. Res. 36.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 76, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 99 Leg.]

YEAS—21

Barrasso	Fischer	Moran
Cornyn	Flake	Paul
Crapo	Grassley	Risch
Cruz	Johnson	Rubio
Daines	Kennedy	Sasse
Enzi	Lankford	Scott
Ernst	Lee	Toomey

NAYS—76

Alexander	Hassan	Peters
Baldwin	Hatch	Portman
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Roberts
Blunt	Heller	Rounds
Boozman	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Hoeven	Schatz
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Cantwell	Inhofe	Shaheen
Capito	Isakson	Shelby
Cardin	Jones	Smith
Carper	Kaine	Stabenow
Casey	King	Sullivan
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Manchin	Tillis
Corker	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	McCaskey	Van Hollen
Cotton	McConnell	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wicker
Gardner	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	Young
Graham	Nelson	
Harris	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Duckworth	McCain
--------	-----------	--------

The motion was rejected.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WARNER. The Senator will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I thank the Senator, and I appreciate that very much.

I just want to make a brief statement about the vote that just took place. I tried to communicate this, and there wasn't time before the vote. Right now, we have more threats than we have ever had in the history of this country. I think we all realize that.

General Dunford said that we are losing our qualitative and quantitative advantage over our adversaries. He was talking about Russia and China, in this case. We have adversaries out there that are actually ahead of us in terms of their capabilities in artillery and other areas.

Here we are, and, quite frankly, we knew how this vote was going to come out. I have a list of the same vote that has taken place for the last 5 years, and it came out the same way it did before. The point here is that even though it wasn't going to pass, the problem is, it is sending a message to our kids who are out there in harm's way.

We look and we see that we have started our road to recovery, and it has been an exciting thing because we came so close to being in a position where one-third of our brigade combat teams didn't work. The F-35s in the field—the Marines could use less than half of them. All of these things were going on because of what has happened to our military.

Finally, we turned the corner. We turned the corner on the last vote—not the one we took today but the one we took a few months ago—and we now are rebuilding our military.

I had breakfast this morning with the Secretary of the Army and with the Chief of the Army, and really good things are happening. I can't think of anything worse than to send a message to our kids in the field that we are going to go back and undo the positive things that have pulled us up into a competitive position.

For the sake of our military, for the sake of defending America, the vote there was to vote against sending the wrong message to our kids in harm's way.

I thank Senator WARNER for yielding.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume executive session and consideration of the Haspel nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank our friend, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina.

We have gone through a lot over the last couple of years, and I appreciate the fact that in terms of timing, he is going to allow me to speak first on Gina Haspel.

Gina Haspel is among the most qualified people to be nominated for the position of the Director of the CIA. She has served with the Agency for 33 years, including tours as a Case Officer, four times as a Station Chief, the Deputy Chief of National Resources Division, the Deputy Director of the National Clandestine Service, and currently as the Deputy Director of the Agency. In many ways, her story is representative of the thousands of people at the Agency and throughout the intelligence community who serve quietly, without recognition, and often at great personal risk in order to keep our Nation safe from those who wish to do us harm.

In addition, while she has not emphasized this, we should not overlook the historic nature of Ms. Haspel's nomination as the first woman to be nominated as Director of the CIA. Seeing her portrait in the halls of the Agency next to the long line of former Directors will be a long overdue but important breakthrough for the intelligence community.

I would also note that as a Senator from Virginia, the home to thousands of CIA personnel and the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, I have heard from many Agency officers—and for that matter, members of the rank and file of other intelligence community agencies—and almost to a person, the rank and file have supported her nomination.

Let me be clear. This has not been an easy decision for me. Over the past several weeks, I have held multiple meetings and calls with Ms. Haspel and many others about her record and her character. In our open hearing, I raised questions about her involvement with the rendition, detention, and interrogation program and, if she were to be confirmed, her willingness to push back if President Trump asked her to undertake any immoral or legally questionable activity. I questioned her willingness to declassify, to the extent possible, more information about her background at the Agency. I still wish more could be done to discuss her background in an open setting. The Agency just recently has declassified more information about her service with the counterterrorism center. I thank them for that but still believe it would have been preferable if we could have found a way to be even more transparent. If she is confirmed as Director, I would encourage Ms. Haspel to keep this in mind.

To those here who have concluded that Ms. Haspel's background with the RDI program should preclude her from leading the CIA, well, I respect their arguments, and I know the passion with which they put forward their position. I myself struggled with this point.

Many people at the CIA participated in the program. They were told it was legal by the Justice Department and ordered by the President, but some of the actions undertaken were repugnant and amounted to torture. Since those days, America has had a long debate about the standards that we, as a nation, can and should apply to the treatment of detainees regardless of who they might be. That is why I was one of the 17 cosponsors in the Senate of the McCain-Feinstein amendment to prohibit torture and to prohibit any interrogation techniques not authorized by the U.S. Army Field Manual. That is why I voted to both approve and to declassify the Senate Intelligence Committee's extensive study of the RDI program.

I strongly believe that we, as Americans, have a duty to look squarely at our mistakes and not to sweep them under the rug but to learn from them and, in the future, to do better. Nor do I believe that we can excuse torture or the way in which detainees—no matter who they were or what crimes they were guilty of—were treated. We are better than that, and we need a CIA Director who will ensure in an ironclad way that we will never return to those days, that we will follow the law as enacted by Congress.

This is why I pushed Ms. Haspel, both in our hearings and in our private meetings, on this very point: What is her view now of the RDI program? And how will she react if she were asked, as Director, to undertake something similar in the future? In both our one-on-one meetings and in classified sessions before the committee, I found Acting Director Haspel to be forthcoming regarding her views on that program. However, I thought it was important that she say this in public, not just privately, which is why I asked her to memorialize those comments in writing.

Gina Haspel wrote: "With the benefit of hindsight and my experience as a senior Agency leader, the enhanced interrogation program is not one the CIA should have undertaken."

I believe this is a clear statement of growth as a leader and learning from mistakes of the past. While I also wish that she would have been more forceful, I also understand her reluctance to condemn the many men and women at the Agency who thought they were doing the right thing at that time.

I first met Gina at one of her overseas postings, but I didn't really get to work with her until this last year, when the former Director appointed her to be Deputy Director of the Agency. Over the last year, I have found her to be professional and forthright with our Intelligence Committee.

I have had the ability to have candid, unfiltered discussions with her. Whether the challenge we confront is North Korea, ISIS terrorists, or the long-term challenges of countries like China and Russia, I will feel safer knowing that the CIA has Ms. Haspel at the helm.

Most importantly, I believe she is someone who can and will stand up to

the President and who will speak truth to power. If this President orders her to do something illegal or immoral, such as return to torture, she will refuse. I believe this not just because she has told me so or because she wrote it in a letter or even because she said it in front of the committee under oath; I believe it, as well, because I have heard it from people who have worked with her for years, people who know and trust her—John Brennan, Jim Clapper, Leon Panetta, Jim Mattis, and many, many others who have served Presidents of both parties. Every one of them has said that they trust her to push back on actions that might be inappropriate coming from this President.

I furthermore believe that she is someone who will push back—and push back strongly—against any attempts by this President to undercut, denigrate, or ignore the professional men and women of the CIA and their responsibility, again—first and foremost—to speak truth to power, whatever the political implications may be.

It is for these reasons that I am supporting Gina Haspel's nomination to be the Director of the CIA. I respect my colleagues who made a different decision. This is not an easy choice. I, too, have spent weeks working through it, but at the end of the day and as we vote, hopefully, later this afternoon, I believe Gina Haspel should be confirmed. I look forward to supporting her. I look forward to her being a good Director of the CIA. I look forward to her performance, convincing those who could not support her today that her long-term value to our country will make our Nation safer and that she will act in accordance with the principles and values of our country.

I yield the floor and 30 seconds to my colleague, the chairman of the committee.

I want to thank him, as well, for continuing to push not only Ms. Haspel but the Agency, the Department of Justice, and others to make sure that members of the committee and, to another extent, Members of the Senate had as much access to information as ever before with any CIA Director. I value our working relationship with the committee. Sometimes the chairman and I don't always agree, but we always deal with things in a straightforward manner.

I yield the floor to my dear friend, the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I thank the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, and I would also reiterate what he said. This is one of the last bipartisan committees on the Hill. It should be. It is because we are entrusted with seeing things and hearing things that nobody else can and verifying that we live within the letter of the law and the Presidential directives for the rest of the 85 Members of the Senate and the American people. We take that very seriously.

I rise today in support of Gina Haspel, the President's nominee to be the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Ms. Haspel has been asked to lead one of our Nation's most treasured assets, an Agency that works in the shadows. It requires a leader with unwavering integrity who will ensure that the organization operates lawfully, ethically, and morally.

Gina was born in Kentucky. She was the oldest of five children. Her father was in the Air Force. She traveled from place to place. She told her dad one day that she wanted to go to West Point, only to hear her dad very gently remind her that West Point did not invite women. That did not delude her sense of service. After graduating from the University of Kentucky, Gina went on to work as a contractor with the 10th Special Forces Group. It was at Fort Devens that Gina learned about the CIA, a place where she could serve her country along with other women doing clandestine work around the world. This excited her.

In 1985 Gina swore an oath to defend the Constitution and began a 30-plus year career of service at the Agency. Since that day, Gina Haspel has developed extensive overseas experience and served as Chief of Station in several locations around the world that we can't mention. But I can tell my colleagues that every time I traveled abroad to a location where Gina was the Chief of Station, I received the most thorough brief from the most organized station that I have had the opportunity to see.

In Washington she has consistently proven herself a strong leader, rising to the role of Deputy Director of the National Clandestine Service and then Deputy Director of the entire Central Intelligence Agency. Those who saw her approach to that role say she served as a peacemaker, a general, a tough advocate for people, and a clear, steady guide for an Agency dealing with a complex web of world crisis.

I believe Ms. Haspel's experience, her dedication to service, and her judgment make her a natural fit to lead the CIA as it enters a period of profound change and uncertainty. She is, by many accounts, the most qualified person the President could have chosen to lead the CIA and the most prepared individual in the 70-year history of this Agency. She is intimately familiar with the threats facing our Nation. Where others can discuss world events, Gina Haspel has lived those events. She has no learning curve.

She has acted morally, ethically, and legally over a distinguished 30-year career. She has earned the respect of the Agency workforce, of her peers, of Republicans and Democrats, of military officers, and of civilian security leaders, evidenced by the number of letters received in support of her nomination—too numerous to read.

Gina has also the courage to speak truth to power, and she has demonstrated that courage time and again. She has a clear-eyed vision for the

Agency and its future, informed by her career and her past experiences. Previous outside leaders of the CIA have worked hard to understand the Agency they were asked to run. But when a case officer, just back from a war zone, describes to Gina the credibility of a newly recruited asset and the challenges of dodging check points to get to a meeting with a source, she knows all the right questions to ask because she has been there and she has done that.

For all these reasons, I support Gina Haspel to be the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I am also mindful of the historic nature of Gina Haspel's nomination and what it means for those first-tour case officers and junior analysts who will join the Agency this year and in the years to come.

As I said at Ms. Haspel's nomination hearing, outside the Agency workforce, not many Americans get an opportunity to walk the halls of the old headquarters building. Those who do, after entering, encounter a series of portraits depicting former Directors of the OSS, Central Intelligence, and the Central Intelligence Agency, as its name has morphed. Some of these Directors were loved. Some were controversial. Some little understood the Agency they were asked to lead. Some made disastrous decisions out of hubris or inexperience or both. But one thing is common: All the portraits are of men.

Many want to make Gina's nomination about one small piece of the Agency's past. If that were the standard that this institution applies, John Brennan would never have been confirmed as the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency because when he was at the Agency, he was fourth in command, versus Gina Haspel, who was a GS-15. Most of us, though, are looking toward the Agency's future.

Avril Haines, Meroe Park, and many others who have served or are currently serving have cracked the glass ceiling at the Agency. Gina is poised to break it. It may be impossible to measure the importance of that breakthrough, but I do know that it will send a signal to the current workforce and to the workforce of the future that a lifetime of commitment to the Agency and its mission can and will be rewarded. To those walking for hours to get to a source meeting, to those officers who stay up all night preparing for the Presidential daily brief, to those making tough calls about putting their people in harm's way to secure the intelligence we need to keep our country safe, to those who find a needle in a haystack, catch the bad guys, find the weapon shipments, and come home and walk past a wall of stars at the Agency, know that we support you and we support the job you do. You deserve a Director who understands who you are, what you do, what you can do, and what you should do. You deserve a Director who understands your sacrifice and has a clear vision for the future of

the Agency and its mission. You deserve Gina Haspel.

I ask that we in this body this afternoon confirm Gina Haspel as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency without further delay.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICA EMBASSY IN JERUSALEM

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to give thanks and celebration for the United States' Embassy established in the city of Jerusalem and for the continued safety and security of the Jewish people in Israel and across the world.

Almost exactly 70 years ago, Israel's founding father, David Ben-Gurion, brought together members of the Jewish People's Council in a Tel Aviv museum to declare the founding of the modern State of Israel. Eleven minutes later, President Harry S. Truman courageously recognized the State of Israel over the objection of many of his advisers and the State Department, and the fates of our two countries have been intertwined ever since, until this week, when the U.S. Embassy was finally moved to Jerusalem, recognizing that it is the eternal capital of the Jewish people and the undivided capital of Israel.

I was proud to have traveled to Jerusalem along with my fellow Senators for the official opening of the new Embassy. It was an incredible honor to witness history unfolding. It was a joyous moment for Israelis, for Americans, and a moment of history.

I had the opportunity to visit with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu about the incredible significance of ending the 70 years of discrimination that Israel had faced. In no other country on Earth did America have our Embassy in a city other than its capital city. It was only Israel where our Embassy was not in the capital.

I would note that for many years Presidents of both parties, Democrats and Republicans, have campaigned promising that they would move the Embassy to Jerusalem, which is the capital of the nation. Yet Presidents of both parties have failed to do so. I commend President Trump for honoring that campaign commitment and for delivering on that campaign commitment.

Moving our Embassy to Jerusalem is an acknowledgement of undeniable truth that Jerusalem is, in fact, the capital of the nation of Israel. It is where we find the supreme court. It is where we find the Prime Minister, and it is where we find the President of Israel.

It is the capital city, and now our Embassy reflects that fact. But moving

the Embassy and recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel has significance beyond that. It has significance because it sends an unmistakable message to our friends and to our enemies that the United States stands with our friends and unshakably stands alongside the nation of Israel.

There was considerable debate within the administration about whether and when to move the Embassy. That has been true in prior administrations as well—considerable debate. The principal argument against moving the Embassy has always been that the enemies of Israel will not like it. I believe that is yet another reason this was the right thing to do.

There were some who made the case that moving the Embassy would diminish the chances of peace in the Middle East. I will confess, I am skeptical that peace will be attained anytime soon. I don't believe the impediment to peace in the Middle East is the nation of Israel. Israel wants peace. It is Israeli babies who are being murdered by the terrorists.

I don't believe we will see peace in the Middle East unless and until, No. 1, the Palestinian leadership acknowledges Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state, and No. 2, they renounce terrorists. As long as the Palestinian leaders are engaging in a unity government with Hamas—an avowed terrorist organization seeking to destroy the nation of Israel and murder innocent Israelis—peace will not be had.

But what I urge President Trump and the administration is that moving the Embassy increases, I believe, the chance for peace. Why is that? Because it demonstrates that America stands strong, stands by our friends, and is not shaken, is not buffeted by global media opinion. I suggested to the administration that our Arab allies in the region would publicly denounce the move. They would have to for domestic political concerns. However, I believe that privately, those allies—the Egyptians, the Jordanians, the Saudis—would be relieved that America moved our Embassy. Why is that? Because an American President and an administration strong enough to move the Embassy and stand up to the nattering nabobs and the press might well also be a President and an administration strong enough to stand up to Iran to end the catastrophic Obama Iranian nuclear deal and to do whatever is necessary to prevent the Ayatollah Khamenei from getting nuclear weapons. Indeed, we saw that assessment was true.

I think it is quite fitting that the opening of the new Embassy occurred just days apart from the President making the historic decision to pull out of the disastrous Obama Iran nuclear deal.

We are seeing the difference between strength and weakness. If history teaches anything, it is that weakness and appeasement do not work. Instead, I think America is far better when we pursue policies of peace through strength.

We all recognize there are those who rage against the existence of the State of Israel. There are the Ayatollahs of Iran who swear "death to Israel and death to America," indeed who refer to Israel as the "Little Satan" and America as the "Great Satan" and who finance terrorism at Israel's doorstep and across the world.

There are the terrorists of Hamas who seized control of the Gaza Strip over a decade ago, after Israel had already fully withdrawn from the territory. For the last several months, Hamas has been organizing civilian mobs with terrorist cells embedded throughout to attack Israel's border and the soldiers stationed there. They call the riots the march of return in reference to what they call their right of return, which is a euphemism for having millions of descendants of Palestinians flood into Israel and destroy the modern State of Israel and its existence as a Jewish state.

Hamas timed their weeks of riots to culminate this week during what they call Nakba Day. "Nakba" means "catastrophe." It is the word they use to reference the creation of Israel. We should understand that. Every year, they denounce what Israel celebrates—the creation of the modern State of Israel. Hamas mourns the catastrophe—to use their word—that Israel even exists. But inevitably, in these battles for survival that Israel faces daily, we can count on global media elite acting as little more than propaganda arms for Hamas and other terrorists, and no week has that been more evident than this week.

I direct you to the front page of the New York Times from this week. The New York Times's headline is "Israel Kills Dozens at Gaza Border as U.S. Embassy Opens in Jerusalem." Anyone reading this headline would say: Goodness gracious. Why are the Israelis murdering people? That is what the New York Times says. One takes from the coverage, apparently, that poor, innocent, unarmed people are being shot for no reason by Israel. That is certainly what the global media elite are portraying.

What are the actual facts? You remember facts—the things that used to be reported when journalists were actually being journalists and not propagandists. Let's talk about the facts. For several weeks, we have seen riots and violent attacks at Israel's border, terrorist attacks that culminated in the attacks that led to these shootings in self-defense. The rioters used massive tire fires to create smoke to cover their attacks. They used guns. They used pipe bombs. They used Molotov cocktails. They used grenades. They used mechanical catapults to attack the border and to attack Israeli troops. They tie petrol bombs to kites, and they launched them to set fire to Israeli fields and livestock.

Let's take a look at the kites. The kites that they used are painted with swastikas. Just so you are not confused

about their motivation, there were pictures taken a couple of weeks ago of kites, of images of swastikas by the Hamas terrorists, with gasoline bombs designed to commit murder and mayhem. The Palestinians in the riots don't hide their motives or intentions. It is not that the New York Times can't figure it out; it is that they don't care.

One 23-year-old rioter said: "We are excited to storm and get inside" and that if he got across the border, he would do "whatever is possible, to kill, throw stones."

I would note that a violent terrorist attacking the border, seeking to murder people, is not a peaceful protester, as the useful idiots in the media falsely portrayed it.

Another Hamas terrorist, who was flying a swastika kite, told NPR:

This is a kite that's going to go to the Jews. . . . The Jews go crazy for Hitler when they see it. . . . This is actually what we want them to know, that we want to burn them.

Let me remind you again of the New York Times headline. The New York Times headline says "Israel Kills Dozens at Gaza Border." Kills dozens of what, of whom? Do they say terrorists? Do they say Hamas terrorists who are flying swastika kites filled with gasoline, seeking to murder Israelis, and who say: "This is actually what we want them to know, that we want to burn them"?

When hearing about brave soldiers protecting innocent civilians from terrorists seeking to murder them, a rational person would say that it is a good thing when terrorists are stopped before they can carry out their acts of terror. But the New York Times can't be bothered to include those facts. There is a message to be conveyed. For anyone lacking nuance or subtly, their message is simple: Israel, bad. Israel, bad. That is their whole subtly. Mind you, the bodies of those poor, helpless, little terrorists—well, you know, when a terrorist seeks to commit murder, we do everything possible to prevent them from doing so.

So when you read the headline, understand that this is who the New York Times is celebrating.

I ask you, why wasn't the swastika on the cover of the New York Times? Might people understand it differently if they actually showed photographs of what was happening?

One of Hamas's Facebook pages posted maps with directions to nearby Israeli communities where thousands of Israelis live within 2 miles of the border. If you look at this map—this map is posted. So you need to understand that these protesters are not just there saying: Make love, man, not war. The New York Times wants to paint them as some happy little hippies with daisies in their ears. Just give peace a chance. You know, John and Yoko were among them. Well, why is Hamas posting this map saying: If you cross the border, here is where the Israeli com-

munities are to go and murder Israelis. Here is the map. They say: If you make it across the border, here is where you can find victims and kill as many of them as possible. They are not hiding their intentions. This is not subtle. If you get across the border, your target is wherever you can find Jews to kill.

These are the terrorists the New York Times celebrates—"Kills Dozens." Why is it that the New York Times doesn't mention the maps that they have to Israeli homes to murder innocent women and children, to kill as many Jews as possible?

Here is a partial list of what happened on the border over just a few hours on Monday:

At 12:53 p.m., there were five pipe-bomb detonations.

At 12:58, another explosive device was detonated.

At 1:15, a terror cell opened fire at Israeli soldiers who caught them trying to plant bombs.

At 1:30, there was another shooting attack on Israeli soldiers.

At 1:45, there was yet another shooting attack, this time by a terrorist cell of eight using the rioters as cover, as human shields.

At 2:09, there were three more bomb detonations.

At 2:13, there was a Molotov cocktail attack.

At 2:49, another one.

At 3:10, there was yet another bomb attack, and so on and so on and so on.

That is just 2 hours. Where in the New York Times headline—and, sadly, this is emblematic of much of the global media elite who are unified in their antagonism to the State of Israel—where is any acknowledgment of pipe bombs, Molotov cocktails, shootings? How would this headline read differently if it read: "Violent Hamas Terrorists Opened Fire on Israelis Who Defend Innocent Civilians Taking the Lives of the Terrorists?" That would actually be news. That would actually be factual. That would actually be describing what happened, instead of becoming a propagandist for the terrorists.

The strategy for these riots, for these terror attacks is a win-win for Hamas. If they breach Israel's fence, then their terrorists can rush into Israeli towns and try to kidnap and kill Israeli civilians. If they fail to reach the fence; if they attack the fence and Israeli soldiers defend Israel and if they are shot, then they know the media—the useful idiots—will provide endless photographs and stories denouncing Israel: How dare you kill terrorists before they are able to murder innocent civilians.

The media has been more than happy to oblige Hamas's propaganda needs. Reporters, celebrity talking heads, and members of our political establishment have faithfully and enthusiastically parroted the Hamas line. They say the riots are the fault of the United States for moving our Embassy and that the rioters are peaceful and unarmed pro-

testers. There is a word for that; it is called a "lie." When so-called journalists repeatedly and deliberately lie in the name of propaganda, well, they shouldn't be surprised to have earned the moniker "fake news."

The Hamas talking points, which are printed by our media, are aimed at whitewashing the terrorists' genocidal hatred of Israel. In fact, these attacks are waged because Hamas refuses to accept the existence of Israel. Mind you, Gaza, they control. Israel doesn't govern Gaza; Hamas governs Gaza. This is an attack on the border of Israel seeking to murder innocent civilians.

The New York Times has been unremitted in its dishonesty. They told their tens of thousands of Facebook followers that Israel "used tear gas and gunfire to keep Palestinian protesters from crossing the border fence with Gaza, killing at least 52, according to Palestinian officials. Forty miles away, officials celebrated the U.S. Embassy's relocation to Jerusalem."

Once again, this is the New York Times pretending to report: Israel "used tear gas and gunfire to keep Palestinian protesters from crossing the border fence with Gaza, killing at least 52." These are not protesters; these are terrorists seeking to murder people.

When you call a terrorist a peaceful and unarmed protester, directly contrary to the facts, you are not engaged in journalism; you are pursuing a political agenda on the pages of the "Old Gray Lady."

Their website's headline on Monday blared: "Israel kills 58 and injures over 1,300 by gunfire at Gaza border. . . . A mass attempt by Palestinians to cross the border fence quickly turned violent, as Israeli soldiers responded with rifle fire."

Gosh, where in their headlines, where in their coverage is there any mention that these are terrorists with bombs and guns and Molotov cocktails and kites carrying gasoline? Oh, no, these were just protesters who, for no reason whatsoever, those bad, bad Israelis decided to shoot. They just got up and said: Let's just shoot a bunch of people. That is what the New York Times tells us. For no reason whatsoever, they just began firing into the crowd.

By the way, if you go into the fever swamps of social media and you see the left—the New York Times knows what its propaganda does. It is not hard to find people on Twitter suggesting that for no reason, Israel just began shooting people because it is fun. Remember, their message is not complicated: Israel, bad. So if Israel is bad, then you just start shooting people because that is how you approach a Monday morning. That is the message, and it is heard by social media. It is heard by anti-Semites across the globe. It plays into vicious blood libels that go back a millennium. It just happens to be a lie. It is not an accidental misstatement; it is a deliberate, calculated, repeated lie.

Undoubtedly, tragically, some of those killed have been Palestinian civilian human shields. This is by design.

Part of what Hamas does is it uses terrorists to commit acts of terror, and then it eyes innocent Palestinians as human shields trying to get them killed because that serves their propaganda purposes. Although I will say that consistently during these riots, it has turned out that the great many of the deaths are of the actual Hamas terrorists picked off while planting bombs and attacking Israeli soldiers. If the American military had been able to shoot the terrorists on 9/11—the terrorists who flew airplanes into the World Trade Center and who flew an airplane into the Pentagon—if the military had been able to stop those terrorists and shoot those terrorists, the New York Times headline would read: “American Military Shoots Peaceful Flying Passengers.”

When you stop a terrorist seeking to commit murder, it is not shooting a peaceful protester. During past riots, Hamas has acknowledged that up to 80 percent of those killed were terrorists. This time around, already, between one-third and one-half of those killed have been identified as terrorists.

Look, this is Hamas telling us this. The people being shot are avowed terrorists. There is no dispute that Hamas is a terrorist organization. There is no dispute. This photograph depicts their wall of martyrs. These are the terrorists we have sent who were killed. Where was the word “terrorist” in the coverage?

We saw on TV images of violence on the border juxtaposed with the image of the embassy unveiling, no doubt intended to put the blame for the attempted terrorism on the United States: How dare the United States of America actually stand with Israel. How dare America open an embassy in the capital of Israel.

The blame for the violence lies with the terrorists, not America for standing with our friend.

These terrorists hated Israel, they hated Jews, and they hated America before we moved our Embassy, and their compatriots hate America, hate Israel, and hate Jews after we have moved our Embassy. Their hatred—their murderous, religious zealotry—is the cause of the murder and of the violence.

A Hamas spokesman went further on TV and said that in the last round of confrontations, if 62 people were martyred, 50 of them were Hamas, but the New York Times just said a bunch of unarmed protesters were standing there when, for no reason, Israeli soldiers began shooting them. What complete mendacity. Hamas admits these are Hamas terrorists. Yet the media does all they can to hide that.

Imagine the outrage if, when the American Embassy in Benghazi was attacked by Ansar al-Sharia in 2012, a newspaper had printed: Americans kill dozens of Libyans. By the way, that is the exact same headline the New York Times used. Yes, protesters coming to commit murder; soldiers fight back to

stop them from committing murder. Fortunately, even the New York Times didn't quite have the gall to say that, but the facts are comparable.

The blame for all of the deaths, whether terrorists or human shields, is on Hamas and Hamas alone. Any implication otherwise is nothing less than shameful support for genocidal terrorism.

In 2014, I introduced in this body bipartisan legislation, along with New York Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, a Democrat, supporting Israel's right to self-defense and condemning Hamas's barbaric tactics, specifically condemning the use of human shields as a war crime. That resolution passed the U.S. Senate unanimously, and it passed the House of Representatives unanimously. Yet we see the tactic yet again, these terrorists using human shields, using innocent Palestinians as human shields, precisely because they want them to die, because they can trust the global media to carry their message.

A few years back, when Israel faced rocket attacks from Hamas, one after the other after the other, Hamas had its headquarters in the basement of a hospital. Indeed, some years ago, I wrote an op-ed entitled “A Tale of Two Hospitals.” It says that you can tell a lot about a society about how they treat their most vulnerable, and it compared two hospitals, one, the Ziv Hospital in northern Israel, which I visited. At the time, the Ziv Hospital had provided over \$8 million in free medical care to Syrians badly wounded in the horrific civil war playing out in Syria, freely caring for their neighbors being murdered by their own head of government. The op-ed contrasted that hospital to the hospital in Gaza in whose basement Hamas had their headquarters.

Now, for Hamas, it was a win-win scenario. Option A is that Israel refrains from hitting the headquarters because it is in the basement of a hospital. That is obviously a win because then the terrorist headquarters doesn't get targeted in a military conflict. That ultimately is what happened, and the Israeli forces did not hit Hamas's headquarters.

Option 2, from Hamas's perspective, is also a win. If Israel did strike at their headquarters—a military target that was launching military attacks trying to murder Israelis—then the result would be pictures of dead bodies on CNN and in the New York Times, pictures of patients at that hospital being used as human shields. It is Hamas desiring the death of little Palestinian babies—newborns in the maternity ward—because they knew if Israel actually took out Hamas's headquarters, they could take those babies, whom Hamas had used as human shields, and they could count on the New York Times.

Can you imagine the headline in the New York Times? “Israel Bombs Babies.” It is not markedly different from

their headline, “Israel Kills Dozens at Gaza Border.” It is propaganda.

As long as Hamas has leaders who manipulate them, who lie to the Palestinian people, who lie to the world, and who use human shields in their bloody terrorist campaign against Israel, there can never be hope for peace or prosperity.

Israel has the right to defend itself, and Israel is defending itself.

I only wish that our global media had some tiny passing qualm of guilt to at least pretend to report the news, to at least pretend to tell the truth, to not function as Hamas's propaganda agents, but instead to tell the truth when Hamas terrorists say, with their Nazi swastika kite bombs: We want the Israelis to know we want them to burn. These are the facts they need to report, even if it happens to disagree with their political agenda of undermining the State of Israel.

Fortunately, regardless of the partisan bias, regardless of the propaganda that the New York Times and other global media outlets put out, America—the American people—stand and will continue to stand unshakably—unshakably—alongside our friends and allies, the people of Israel, and we have reason to celebrate.

When I was in Jerusalem just a couple of days ago, I visited with person after person—Israeli and American—who were reduced to tears. Some were Holocaust survivors. The phrase I heard more often than anything else was this: “I thought I would never live to see the day.” Well, we did live to see the day.

America's Embassy should have been in Jerusalem 70 years ago. It should have been there 60 years ago. It should have been there 50 years ago, 20 years ago, 10 years ago, 1 year ago. But, fortunately, America's Embassy is where it belongs today—in Jerusalem, the once and eternal undivided capital of Israel.

Jerusalem was the capital of Israel 3,000 years ago. Jerusalem is the capital of Israel today, and the United States Government recognizes that, and just as Harry Truman did 70 years ago, is leading the rest of the world to follow suit.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Will the Senator withhold the request?

Mr. CRUZ. I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank the journalists of this country, who are not enemies of the people and who do their jobs every day, explaining complicated issues and fighting every day to do things as straightforwardly and honestly as they can. So I start with that.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. President, each year, during National Police Week, we honor our law enforcement officials and the families

who support them. They all give so much in service to their communities, and too many make the ultimate sacrifice to keep us safe.

I mention the families for a very important reason. Whether it is families of soldiers, marines, deputy sheriffs, police officers, police chiefs, or FBI agents, they share the anxiety and fears and the anxiety and concerns for their loved ones, who are so important. We always honor them too.

This year, we will add the names of 360 officers to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, including the names of 10 Ohioans. We lost six of those Ohioans years or decades ago, and their sacrifice will now be recognized on the memorial.

We pause to honor Franklin Stone, Frank Morrison, Donald Orville McLaughlin, Martin Arnold Stanton, Bradley Thomas Scott, and Samuel John Mautz.

We also honor four Ohioans who laid down their lives last year: Officer David Fahey, of the Cleveland Police Department, the city in which I live; Chief Steven DiSario, of the Kirkersville Police Department; Patrolman Marvin Moyer, of the Lancaster Police Department; and Patrolman Justin Leo, of the Girard Police Department. Each of these losses is a tragedy for a family, for a community, and for fellow police officers.

Sadly, we know already two names that will be added to the Memorial next year from Ohio: Officer Eric Joering and Officer Anthony Morelli, both of the Westerville Division of Police, a Columbus suburb. They laid down their lives in service to their communities and their country just a few months ago, in February.

We cannot begin to repay the debt we owe them and we owe their families, but we can work to support their families and their fellow officers, as they work to keep our communities safe.

This year, as part of the bipartisan spending package, we passed into law the Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act to increase access to educational scholarships for the children of public service officers killed in the line of duty. Helping their children get a quality education is the least we can do for these families.

This spring I led a bipartisan group of Senators in calling for full funding of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership. Last year we were able to secure \$21 million for the partnership, which gets officers the safety equipment they need. Bulletproof vests save lives.

I hope we can soon pass the bipartisan POWER Act. I am working with my colleagues Senators PORTMAN, SCHUMER, RUBIO, MARKEY, and CAPITO.

Deadly, illegal fentanyl has become too common, especially in my State. Our local law enforcement must deal with it on a nearly daily basis. That is why we worked on together and the President signed the bipartisan INTER-DICT Act. It is why we need to build on that and give our local and State law

enforcement the same access to high-tech devices to screen for fentanyl, carfentanil, and other dangerous opioids.

On Tuesday, Ohio law enforcement gathered in my office for a demonstration showing how they can use these screening devices to enhance their ability to investigate drug crimes, while protecting themselves and the Ohioans they serve. They serve us. They protect us. We should do all we can in this body to serve them and to protect them, making a very dangerous job—jobs that police officers do every day—a little safer.

Some Ohio cities use these devices already. One officer at the demonstration, from the Twinsburg Police Department, said his office could use this equipment right now. Our law enforcement officers put their lives on the line to protect us every single day.

This National Police Week, we owe them more than gratitude. Let's do all we can to support the selfless men and women who serve our communities and our country every single day.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in December 2012, the legendary Senator from Hawaii, Daniel Inouye, passed away. He was the longtime chairman and vice chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

By a twist of fate, I succeeded him in that role, and one of the most notable surprises to me was how much of the funding for the intelligence community came with that responsibility.

Together with my earlier service on the Senate Intelligence Committee, I have learned that oversight of the secret agencies of our government is one of the most challenging and important roles of Congress.

It is a difficult task. Many of the issues involved in overseeing the CIA and other agencies are highly technical. Some issues present extraordinary challenges, where the security of our Nation must be balanced with the best interests of the American people. All of these matters are blanketed by the highest degree of secrecy.

Despite all of these oversight challenges, there are issues that are simply black and white. The starkest of these issues in the last two decades was the CIA's program to torture detainees at black sites throughout the world after 9/11.

After 9/11, many Americans thought long and hard about whether to torture terrorists to gain information to stop the next catastrophic attack. Implicit in that moral question is the assumption that we would capture the right people who might have essential intelligence to save American lives.

Last week, the New York Times published an article by a Libyan woman who says she was detained at a black site in Thailand.

Her story details how she and her husband were taken by masked men to a windowless room in Thailand. When moved, she was bound to a stretcher. She was deprived of sleep. She was struck in the abdomen.

The Bush administration used the euphemism "enhanced interrogation techniques" to describe this kind of abuse. Despite their words, this was torture, plain and simple.

The Libyan woman was halfway through a pregnancy at the time. She was then sent to Libya, where she spent weeks in another prison, with a crib in the room, as though she was being mocked for being with child. Her baby was born just after her release.

Last week, the highest levels of the British Government formally apologized for its role in the detention and treatment of her and her husband. No such apology has been forthcoming from the United States.

To understand the full dimensions of the CIA's so-called enhanced interrogation techniques is a difficult task. I commend Senator FEINSTEIN and her staff for an exhaustive report, years in the making, that explains this torture program in great detail. The stress positions, the sleep deprivation, the "walling," the slapping, and the waterboarding, it is all in there, unclassified, for the public to see.

Simply informing the public about what happened is not sufficient. These sad chapters in American history cannot be closed until there is accountability.

The nominee for the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Gina Haspel, exercised a series of leadership positions that involved the CIA's use of these torture techniques. She was in a position to do something about it, had she believed this torture was wrong.

I note that many of her current and former colleagues have endorsed her nomination. They have spoken about her capabilities and effectiveness in positive terms. I do not know how many of them have a detailed understanding of her role in the CIA's torture program.

I met with Ms. Haspel at length and read documents that detailed her role in the torture program. She stated to me that, as a CIA officer, she had been advised by all the appropriate legal authorities that she could carry out her assigned duties and remain within the law.

That may be the case, but that does not explain how a person can see an individual be subjected to waterboarding, and the excruciating feeling that they are going to drown, and not question whether that legal guidance is just. Simply labelling conduct "legal" doesn't make it right.

In fact, we now know that the Bush administration twisted the law in its infamous torture report to justify the use of torture. The Justice Department's legal analysis was informed by false information from the CIA that techniques like waterboarding helped obtain lifesaving information that was otherwise unavailable.

But the decisive issue as to this nominee is much simpler.

The destruction of videotapes of those interrogation sessions remains

an act that is impossible to justify or ignore.

The CIA has provided documents for the review of all Senators that attempt to exonerate Ms. Haspel in the destruction of those tapes.

On December 7, 2007, the day after the destruction of these tapes was first reported, I asked then-Attorney General Michael Mukasey to open a criminal investigation into the destruction of the tapes. This led to the so-called Durham investigation, led by Federal prosecutor John Durham.

Approximately 2 weeks ago, the Department of Justice for the first time provided only certain Members of the Senate with the results of that investigation, called the Durham Report. Few Senators even know that this report exists.

I am the vice chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, which funds the CIA, and a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over the Justice Department. I have asked to review the Durham Report, but the Trump administration has refused.

What does this report conclude? Does it have information that was not available during other reviews? The vast majority of Senators and the American public will never know before the vote is called on this nomination.

We have seen the CIA, which is tasked with providing intelligence, take a strong stand in favor of this nomination. I do not question the right of the administration to push for their appointees. But I do question whether our intelligence community is compromising its objectivity in lobbying the public in favor of the nomination. Given the secrecy over the Durham Report, I can only wonder if we are being told just one side of the story.

I continue to believe that the best interest of our Nation, our Government, and the CIA is to make a clean break from the odious history of torture.

In my time overseeing the CIA, I know that there are many experienced professionals, both inside the intelligence community and outside of it, that are able to lead this agency with great skill and without the history of association with waterboarding.

It is impossible to consider this nomination without thinking of our friend and colleague Senator JOHN MCCAIN.

Senator MCCAIN is an American hero. He survived horrific torture as a POW in Vietnam and since then has spent almost five decades in honorable public service to the country he loves dearly.

While Gina Haspel was accommodating and covering up the torture program, Senator MCCAIN was the first prominent Republican to speak out against this program, which was created by an administration of his own political party.

I was proud to work closely with Senator MCCAIN on what has rightly become known as the McCain torture amendment, which made it clear that torture and cruel, inhuman, and de-

grading treatment are absolutely prohibited in America—no exceptions.

That amendment passed this body on an overwhelming 90-9 vote, despite a veto threat from the Bush administration.

Now, in the twilight of a great American life, Senator MCCAIN has again spoken out against an administration of his own political party, urging us to oppose this nomination because of the nominee's complicity in torture. For that principled stand, Senator MCCAIN has been subjected to crass insults by an administration that doesn't have the decency to properly and publicly apologize to the McCain family.

Ultimately, America's strength and influence abroad rests not just with its military might, but also with the power of its ideas and values, of which torture is the ultimate betrayal.

For these reasons, I oppose the nomination of Gina Haspel.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the nomination of Gina Haspel to become the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Ms. Haspel is an accomplished intelligence professional who will bring 33 years of experience to her new role. She has dedicated her entire life to the service of our country and has performed extraordinarily well in a number of challenging positions—often, in some of the most dangerous places in the world.

Ms. Haspel has widespread support among the national security community. More than 50 leaders signed a bipartisan letter endorsing her nomination. The list includes eight former CIA Directors and Acting CIA Directors who were appointed by both Republican and Democratic Presidents, ranging from Ronald Reagan to Barack Obama. Michael Morell, a former CIA Acting Director under President Obama, describes her as a person of “deep integrity,” and John Brennan, another former CIA Director under President Obama, said she will provide “unvarnished, apolitical, objective intelligence input to Donald Trump and others.”

At Ms. Haspel's hearing before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I questioned Ms. Haspel regarding the enhanced interrogation program that was started after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. I have long believed and have consistently stated that this program was completely unacceptable and that waterboarding is tantamount to torture. In fact, in 2015, I cosponsored the McCain-Feinstein amendment to the defense authorization bill to ensure that techniques such as waterboarding are never used again and that the Army Field Manual governs interrogations of detainees.

In response to my questions, Ms. Haspel, who was not a high-ranking CIA official at the time, indicated that she played no role in the creation of the interrogation program and that she wasn't even aware of its existence until

more a year after it began. Furthermore, she said that she supported the 2015 law changes and made clear that she does not believe that the CIA should be in the “interrogation business.” She testified that, under her leadership, the CIA would follow the law and would not resume enhanced interrogations and that she would not seek to repeal the law.

Moreover, in a letter to the vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator MARK WARNER, Ms. Haspel said that she would “refuse to undertake any proposed activity” that is contrary to her moral and ethical values, CIA's mission and expertise, or the law. “The United States,” she said, “must be an example to the rest of the world” and “the enhanced interrogation program is not one the CIA should have undertaken.”

Another issue I closely examined was Ms. Haspel's role in the Agency's decision to destroy tapes involving one detainee who was subjected to enhanced interrogation. The accountability review from then-Acting Director Morell exonerated Ms. Haspel and stated conclusively that it was the CIA's then-Director of the National Clandestine Service who ordered the destruction of the tapes. As Mr. Morell, an Obama administration appointee, stated: “Ms. Haspel did not destroy the tapes, she did not oversee the destruction of the tapes, and she did not order the destruction of the tapes.”

I will conclude by saying that it speaks very well of Ms. Haspel's nomination that she was reported favorably by a bipartisan majority of members on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, earning the support of both the chairman and vice chairman. I hope that Ms. Haspel will be confirmed quickly to be the next Director of the CIA, and I look forward to working with her in this new capacity to counter the wide range of national security challenges facing our country.

Mr. BROWN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as the Senate moves to vote on the nomination to head the CIA, here is the bottom line. While the American people have been told that Gina Haspel likes Johnny Cash and talked to Mother Teresa, Ms. Haspel has been exercising the unprecedented power to personally censor any facts about her that might get in the way of her nomination.

When the Senate votes on a nomination when all the relevant information is, by design, kept secret, how is this any different than a coverup? I regret to have to say that the surrender of the Senate's responsibility to conduct real

oversight of this nominee means that Gina Haspel has been given a pass on all the most important and the most relevant issues.

I am going to start with three.

The first is this: What was her opinion about the CIA's torture program when it was happening?

The Washington Post newspaper reported that unnamed officials were pushing back against accusations that she has supported torture.

Now, Ms. Haspel said she learned about the program in 2002. I believe it is especially important to know what her views were later, between 2005 and 2007, when the CIA itself was winding the program down. At that time, did Ms. Haspel call for the program to be continued or expanded? I asked her that in an open intelligence meeting. She did not come close to answering that crucial question.

No. 2, what was her role in the destruction of the torture tapes? The nominee's story here is riddled with holes, and key facts have been covered up.

One matter that we know about is that her boss at the time, Mr. Jose Rodriguez, has publicly contradicted her account of the handling of the destruction of the torture tapes to a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist.

No. 3, how can the Senate possibly take seriously Ms. Haspel's confirmation conversion on torture that was submitted on the eve of a crucial vote?

There has been a lot of reporting in the press saying that she personally played a role in the CIA torture program. The American people deserve to know whether those reports are true. Every single material question to her about them has been met with stonewalling and evasion. Instead of real responses, Ms. Haspel offered possibly the latest confirmation conversion in history, 16 years after she first learned about the torture program and only just before a vote on her confirmation.

Over and over again, I and other Senators have insisted that Ms. Haspel declassify information about her background that would not in any way compromise the safety of the American people. This is information that is directly relevant to her nomination. In the language of the Intelligence Community—I have read it—the overwhelming bulk of this information can be declassified without compromising sources and methods. Yet every single time a Senator pushed for declassification, Gina Haspel said no. Despite our repeated requests, she decided she would not allow the American people to know who she is and what she has done.

This has been—and, again, it is painful to have to say this—a stark failure of Senate oversight, and it is about as flagrant an example as I have ever seen. The Senate should have stood up to this self-serving abuse of power, but it did not.

For me, it is democracy 101 that confirmations are not supposed to take

place in secret. Nominees don't get to decide what is known about them. Yet this core principle—core principle of our democracy has just been chucked in the trash. Instead of standing up for the Constitution and for the American people, the Senate could be rewarding Gina Haspel and the CIA for this extraordinary and self-serving abuse of power.

With respect to other issues, it is important to note that the Agency—again, under the direction of Ms. Haspel—has also conducted an unprecedented influence campaign to promote her confirmation. This, too, is wrong. The CIA, like every government agency, works for the American people. It is not supposed to use its enormous power to serve the personal interests of whoever is running it. The classification rules are there for national security. They are not there for the political security of an individual. They are there to protect the dedicated women and men who undertake dangerous missions undercover. They are not there to shield a nominee for a Senate-confirmed job from scrutiny.

I and a number of my colleagues have looked at the classified information about Ms. Haspel and have concluded it can be released to the public without compromising sources and methods. We asked how she could justify keeping it secret. Her answer almost always is, that is how “we always protect our officers.”

I want people to understand what is wrong with that statement. Of course, the CIA must protect undercover CIA officers. I don't take a backseat to anybody in this Chamber for protecting those people who are undercover. In fact, I wrote a law, along with Senator Bond, our former colleague, increasing the penalty for outing people who are undercover. Gina Haspel is not undercover. She is asking the U.S. Senate to be vested with a position that would make her one of the most public and visible intelligence leaders in the world.

This is not an undercover job. It is one of the most visible national security positions, not just in our country but in the world. It ought to be accompanied by accountability, and hiding behind the protections that are rightly given undercover officers to advance her career I find absurd.

I wish to also note that her classification decisions are in violation of Executive Order No. 13526. For decades, the intelligence community has been barred from keeping information classified to prevent embarrassment or conceal violations of law or administrative error. It is pretty clear those rules are not high up on Ms. Haspel's priority list.

What I am especially worried about—I am going to go into this—is that if you can violate the classification rules to get confirmed, the Senate says: Oh, no big deal, it is going to get done again and again.

Last time I looked, most Americans believed this country needs more ac-

countability, more transparency, and less unnecessary secrecy.

Much of the attention on the nomination has been about the press reports of Ms. Haspel's role in the CIA torture program. Throughout the process, she has flatout refused to confirm or deny if she had any connection to it. How can this possibly be classified? Three years ago, the Senate Intelligence Committee released a 500-page executive summary of the torture report. The CIA released a long and detailed response. What the CIA did to all those detainees is now officially declassified. Former CIA officers have written whole books about it. How in the world can you say Ms. Haspel's reported involvement in the program is classified? You can do it because she says so, and she is the boss.

At one point, I asked Ms. Haspel whether opinions about the CIA torture program expressed by CIA officers were classified. I wasn't even asking then about anyone's involvement in the program, just what people might have thought about it. Ms. Haspel wouldn't answer that question either. She said that even the matter of whether those opinions are classified is itself classified—downright Orwellian, in my view.

In a democracy, there have to be some basic rules about what is and what isn't classified. We are seeing a replacement of those rules with essentially the whims of leaders who aren't accountable. Secret law—the classification of legal interpretations rather than sources and methods—is a serious problem, including at Ms. Haspel's CIA. Information that doesn't need to be classified to protect national security is being covered up for political purposes.

Speaking of Orwell, the classification rules themselves are going to be classified. I have been concerned about this tendency for years. I want to emphasize, I have made this clear to political leaders of both political parties, and I continue to believe that. But if the CIA and Ms. Haspel can get away with all this, the worst is yet to come.

As I have been saying since she was nominated, I have a host of concerns about all of these issues. I hope Senators will exercise independent judgment. There is a classified Intelligence Committee minority memo about Ms. Haspel, and I hope every Senator will read it and ask themselves publicly, “If the American people actually knew about all this, how would I vote?”

What I can say is, her classified comments about her background have been as troubling as her public testimony. What I can say is, when I did get unclassified responses to my questions, they certainly were not assuring. Public discussions about the CIA have generally been about overseas operations affecting foreigners. It has been decades since the public really focused on the danger that the CIA could violate the privacy of Americans, but the danger is there, and hard questions ought to be asked.

One example is section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, recently reauthorized by the Congress. The CIA has the authority, under that law, to identify foreign targets and then to search through the communications of those targets for particular Americans. The CIA can conduct these backdoor searches of Americans without a warrant. That creates a danger of reverse targeting, which is when the government, in this case the CIA, targets a foreigner to find out what an American is saying.

One way to help prevent reverse targeting is to recognize that when the government is conducting lots of backdoor searches on Americans and then sending around reports on those Americans, maybe it is the Americans whom the government is really interested in. By the way, the privacy board agrees with it, and so does the current Assistant Attorney General for National Security.

Given all that—the prospect of what it would mean for Americans—I asked Ms. Haspel about it. Again, what I got back were plenty of words but nothing that provided any assurance that the CIA has any system at all for guarding against reverse targeting of Americans under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Also, the Agency collects a lot of intelligence under an Executive Order known as 12333. I wanted to know if the Agency was conducting backdoor searches on Americans through that data. The current Director of the National Security Agency told me that when the NSA conducts searches of Americans, those searches have to be approved on a case-by-case basis, with probable cause, by the Attorney General. The NSA doesn't actually have to go to court, which is a concern. But those requirements create meaningful hurdles to abuse. I thought it was important to ask about the CIA: When can the CIA conduct backdoor searches of Americans?

The response I got from Ms. Haspel is that the searches are authorized if they are designed to get information related to the CIA's activities. That means there is no standard at all on backdoor searches of Americans.

I have mentioned these two unclassified examples because they show how vague the rules are and how easily the CIA could violate the privacy of Americans. That is why it is important to have leaders at the Agency who believe in the privacy of the American people and who are committed to protecting it, protecting Americans—protecting Americans even if sometimes a lawyer says something might be technically legal. I don't believe Gina Haspel will be that kind of leader.

Before I wrap up, there are a couple of other matters with respect to the torture program. I mentioned that since the torture program has been largely declassified, it can be discussed openly. Senator MCCAIN, whom we admire so much, said last week that Ms.

Haspel's refusal to acknowledge torture's immorality is disqualifying. I am going to talk a bit more about Senator MCCAIN before I wrap up. I have always been a JOHN MCCAIN guy on a lot of issues. I came to the Senate and joined the Commerce Committee that he chaired, and I will talk a little about that, but he sure sums it up right on torture. He says: It is wrong. It harms America because of the statement it makes about American values around the world. Then he points out it is not effective.

Since the program has been largely declassified, it can be discussed openly. The CIA captured innocent people. It tortured dozens of detainees. It didn't just waterboard people. The CIA played detainees in ice water. It kept them awake for a week. It stuffed detainees in small boxes. The list goes on and on. They were always worse than how they were described to Congress or the Department of Justice.

Through it all, it seemed that the CIA and the government had not really held anybody accountable. The CIA also provided numerous false claims to the Department of Justice, to Congress, and to everybody else about torture.

Now, I have never been a big believer in confirmation conversions. My general take is that nominees will say about anything to get confirmed, but Ms. Haspel's statement with respect to torture has to be the most delayed and the most grudging confirmation conversion in history. She said she learned about the torture program in 2002. It took 16 years before she was willing to say anything critical about it.

I mentioned asking her about her views when the program was winding down. That was not something that was a debatable proposition, as it was in public source materials. The CIA was winding down the program. It was capturing fewer people and no longer using the waterboarding.

So what were her views on the program? I asked her specifically because it was in public sources. When the Agency was winding down the program, was she for continuing it or even expanding it? I asked her twice—in the hearing and in a written question. Her quote was that she was "committed." Figure out what that means. To me, that is about as clear an evasion of a very important issue as I can find.

Apropos of the present, usually nominees offer their confirmation conversions before the eve of the key vote. I had mentioned that this was awfully grudging. The Agency shouldn't have undertaken a torture program, she said, because it did damage our officers and our standing in the world.

That is true, but at no time did she ever express regret or anything that reflected that this was just plain wrong. She offered up the classic Washington, almost nonapology. She was not sorry for what the Agency did. She was just not happy with how it was perceived.

Worse still are some of the justifications for the torture program that she

is still providing. For example, she is still arguing that the program produced valuable intelligence. She says it is unknowable whether the torture techniques produced valuable intelligence.

Yet it is knowable. The intelligence that the CIA attributed to torture came from other sources. When the committee looked at the CIA's own records, it found that key intelligence was provided by detainees before the CIA engaged in the torture. It is these kinds of documented facts that have made Ms. Haspel's statements so troubling.

Why are her equivocations about the effectiveness of torture so important? I think we all remember the campaign in the fall of 2016, when then-Candidate Trump said: "Torture works." It seems to me that it is not in America's interest to have a CIA Director who responds with: Well, there are a lot of aspects to the issue, and I am not happy about how the Agency was perceived in terms of what it did.

With regard to JOHN MCCAIN, like a lot of Senators, I am thinking now about some of the big battles and tough fights that we had a chance to work on together. I became Oregon's first new Senator in almost 30 years. Oregon has always been about wood products, and it always will be. I said I would go to the Senate and fight like crazy to get more jobs to those rural areas and try to get Oregon and our country into some new fields.

It is not generally known, but in those days, JOHN MCCAIN had just become the chairman of the Commerce Committee.

I went to him, and I asked: Mr. Chairman, why don't you and Chairman LEAHY, who has been a stalwart on these issues, lead an effort to try to write the rules of the road for the internet?

By and large, there were not any.

He kind of smiled at me—that quintessential JOHN MCCAIN smile—and basically said: Why don't you go out and figure out how to do it, and we will have a hell of a good time in making the case.

Under JOHN MCCAIN's leadership, what we did was to, in fact, write the rules of the road for 10,000 taxing jurisdictions in America. As a result of those early days, you can't discriminate against electronic commerce, which would have clobbered the internet with thousands of discriminatory decisions. There were digital signatures. We wrote the regulatory rules for social media that are often cited as creating \$1 trillion worth of wealth in the private economy.

To a great extent, JOHN MCCAIN brought his typical passion to those new areas that he would be the first to say he didn't know everything about, but he said: Hey, look, we ought to do something that is in America's interest.

We didn't care about Democrats, and we didn't care about Republicans.

As Senators proceed to this vote in a half hour—a historic vote, in my opinion—I hope they will reflect on what JOHN MCCAIN has had to say about torture. He has said Ms. Haspel's refusal to acknowledge torture's immorality is disqualifying. JOHN MCCAIN has urged the Senate to reject her nomination.

JOHN MCCAIN has been a towering authority on this issue and has been a guiding light for the Senate on national security policy. I also just mentioned something I don't think anybody knew, which is about writing the rules of the road for the internet.

It is my hope that JOHN MCCAIN's powerful and unimpeachable views on the issue of torture and this nominee will continue to be heard today and well into the future. There is no greater voice on this subject than JOHN MCCAIN's.

I want him to know how grateful I am for his leadership on this and how, in the days ahead, I look forward to, hopefully, being able to tell my grandchildren what a man of stature and public service really brought to the Senate. I hope Senators will reflect on that before they vote.

Throughout this nomination process, there were not a whole lot of topics that were declassified. So I am just going to share a story about Ms. Haspel and the destruction of the videotapes.

There is important information in the report by U.S. Attorney John Durham that most Senators were not allowed to see. Like everything else about her career, the information that reflects poorly on Ms. Haspel gets covered up, but we did learn some things about Ms. Haspel and the destruction of the torture videotapes. For one, she wrote the cable that authorized the destruction. Second, she was an advocate for destroying the tapes and was involved in what former Acting Director Mike Morell called "efforts to press for and facilitate a resolution of the matter." That is a lot more than drafting a cable.

Especially problematic for Ms. Haspel and her boss, Jose Rodriguez, is that there were reservations or there was even outright opposition from the White House, the head of national intelligence, the CIA, and the Congress to the destruction of the tapes. So Mr. Rodriguez decided to go it alone and sent the cable Ms. Haspel had drafted without telling the lawyers, the CIA Director, or anyone else.

Here is where Ms. Haspel's story about the destruction of the tapes really runs into trouble. Jose Rodriguez, her boss, gave an interview in which he told Ms. Haspel in advance that he was planning on sending the cable without seeking authorization. So I asked her about that story. She denied it. I don't know who is telling the truth. Yet here we are, voting on this nominee without our having this direct contradiction in any way resolved.

Then there is the question of what happened after the cable was sent but before the tapes were actually de-

stroyed. Ms. Haspel has said that she was at her desk and could see her computer screen. So it was shortly after the cable was sent that she became aware of it. She said it was at that point that she walked over to discuss it with Mr. Rodriguez.

So what did she do? She knew that the destruction of evidence had been ordered over everyone's objections. Did she intervene to stop the destruction before it happened? Did she tell the lawyers in time for them to intervene? Did she tell the White House? Did she tell the head of national intelligence? Did she just let it happen?

These are central questions because they tell us what kind of leader Ms. Haspel is. In order to get confirmed, she has made all kinds of promises about standing up for what is right and rejecting inappropriate orders. But what did she do when she knew an order had been sent to destroy evidence over the objections of lawyers and everybody else? There is no record of her doing anything to stop it.

I offer this small window into her background because, I think, we all ought to be asking how might she react when confronted with an illegal, immoral, or inappropriate direction.

I mentioned what the President said earlier in the campaign—that he would bring back a hell of a lot worse than waterboarding. He has praised Ms. Haspel for being tough on terror. You don't have to be Picasso to connect the dots about what the dangers are here. Other than a few belated promises that were made to get confirmed, what evidence is there, actually, to suggest that Ms. Haspel would really push back?

I close, simply, with this. I have an enormous amount of respect for the good work being done by those at the CIA. The nature of the secret, risk-taking work that they do is an extraordinary service to the American people. My concern is that when something goes off the rails, it is going to be because of a variety of scenarios that will not have a lot to do with their good work. For example, it could be because there is a CIA Director who sees every lawyer's approval as a green light and every lawyer's warning as an annoyance. It could be because CIA leadership decides to hide from public scrutiny information that need not be classified.

My concerns about Ms. Haspel are not a matter of history. I have concerns about what she is saying today, both about her background and about current programs. I am concerned that after we have heard from JOHN MCCAIN and each of us has reflected, as I have briefly, on our extraordinary experiences with this unique public servant, we will still have to make a judgment here. I hope that colleagues, when they vote in a little bit, will recognize that there is much more that the full Senate and the American people have a right to know. I believe that if they did, they would join Senator MCCAIN and me in opposing this nomination.

I regret to have to say, as I did in the beginning, that I believe the Senate has surrendered its responsibility to do real oversight here. This process has been a disservice to our constitutional duty. I believe the American people deserve to know more than that Gina Haspel likes Johnny Cash while she is simultaneously exercising the power to censor the facts about her background. I urge colleagues to reject this nomination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency is not as old an office as some others in the President's Cabinet, but it is no less important. The Director's job is to provide the critical information on which the President's national security decisions are based. For this reason, Presidents of both parties have chosen seasoned statesmen to serve this post, men like Allen Dulles, George H.W. Bush, Bob Gates, and Mike Pompeo. Out of respect for the CIA's integrity and professionalism, they often kept in office Directors who had been appointed by their predecessors. That is because partisanship has no place at the CIA.

The national interest must be uppermost in our minds, which is why I will be voting to confirm Gina Haspel as our next CIA Director. Secretary Pompeo left the Agency in good shape, and Ms. Haspel was his very capable Deputy. Moreover, few people have contributed as much to the CIA's recent successes as Ms. Haspel. She has 33 years of experience working for the Agency, serving first on the frontlines of the Cold War and later on the frontlines of the War on Terror. If confirmed, she would also be the first woman to lead the Agency.

Given her many accomplishments, her diligence, dedication, and her fierce love of country, I am astonished and disappointed at the controversy over the nomination of this great American. After all, Ms. Haspel is a career professional whose record of achievement speaks for itself.

She joined the Agency in 1985, working as a case officer for several years in both Africa and Europe. Over time, she rose up the ranks, serving first as Chief of Staff and then as Deputy Director of the Directorate of Operations. She served as Chief of Station—the officer responsible for overseeing all of the CIA's work in a foreign country—four different times.

Having served under six different Presidents from both parties, Ms. Haspel has never been a partisan. She is a professional whose many years of work command respect throughout the CIA. She has never avoided controversy to protect her own career.

Time and again, Ms. Haspel sought out danger. She raised her right hand and volunteered for some of the Agency's most dangerous assignments.

It was on September 11, 2001, after seeing the first plane hit the World

Trade Center on television, that she walked into the CIA's Counterterrorism Center and said: Put me on the job. She didn't have to do that. As she said, she could have hidden out on the Swiss desk, but she didn't. She took on what she knew would be a tough and controversial job. That is the kind of woman Gina Haspel is.

It is true that because of her willingness to take on a tough job, she was present for some of the most difficult decisions about how to protect America in the days after 9/11. Yes, she was around when the Agency was responsible for the detention and interrogation of notorious terrorists, but there has been so much misinformation spread about what she did that I want to set the record straight.

Ms. Haspel didn't start this program. She didn't even know it existed until a year after it began. In fact, NANCY PELOSI learned about this program before Gina Haspel did.

She did not "cheerlead" the program, as some Senators have wrongly claimed based on a book—the author of which later issued a correction on this very point.

Other Senators claim they are worried about the message that would be sent by confirming Ms. Haspel. I confess, I am amazed that these Democrats say they can't in good conscience vote on the confirmation of Ms. Haspel, who was a midlevel employee when the program was active, yet they voted in 2013 to confirm John Brennan, who was the No. 4 ranking official at that time.

While I am at it, let me also say that she did not destroy any tapes of those interrogations; she simply wrote the draft cable for her boss, the Director of Operations, which authorized their destruction. He released the cable, he has acknowledged, without her advance knowledge. In fact, the former Acting Director of the CIA, Mike Morrell, later conducted an investigation and cleared Ms. Haspel of any wrongdoing, and the special counsel who reviewed the matter closed the case without filing any charges.

Would holding her responsible for drafting a cable at her boss's direction make any more sense than holding Senate staffers responsible for the boring speeches their bosses give on the Senate floor?

Yes, I know there are political officials in the government who had expressed reservations about destroying those tapes, but no lawyer at any time, anywhere in the government, said there was a legal prohibition against their destruction. Moreover, there is a clear, written record of those very events.

On these matters, it is not enough to express reservations. CIA officers in the field deserve a clear answer, yes or no.

If anyone was to blame, it wasn't Ms. Haspel or her boss; it was politicians who didn't want to take the heat for a controversial decision either way.

So what is really at issue here? What message will we send if we reject her

nomination? Not that we oppose torture. That is silly. We all oppose torture. The United States does not torture, and it has never tortured, despite overwrought claims to the contrary.

In fact, I would ask what message we will be sending to the men and women of the CIA if we don't confirm her or, for that matter, what message the overwhelming Democratic opposition to her nomination sends them. Does anyone doubt that if President Obama or a President Hillary Clinton had nominated Ms. Haspel, she would easily have received 80 or 90 votes?

The message, I would submit, is this: Be careful. If you participate in a program that the Commander in Chief has approved, that the Congress has been fully briefed on, that the Attorney General has legally authorized, and that the CIA Director supports, you still may land in the dock when a new President comes along with new lawyers. So maybe it is better to hide out at the Swiss desk.

That is a recipe for a timid, hesitant intelligence community, and that is a risk to us all.

I can tell you, Gina Haspel's skill and expertise are widely known and respected on both sides of the aisle. President Obama's former CIA Director, Leon Panetta, said that he was glad the President nominated Ms. Haspel because she "knows the CIA inside-out." Another one of President Obama's CIA Directors, John Brennan, said that Ms. Haspel "has the experience—the breadth and depth—on intelligence issues." And former CIA Director Michael Hayden, who served under both Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, has called Gina Haspel a "great choice" and "highly regarded." These are just three of more than 50 former national security officials who signed a letter to the Senate Intelligence Committee supporting her nomination.

As a member of that committee, I worked with Gina Haspel during her time overseas and as Deputy CIA Director, and I can attest to her professionalism, her work ethic and, most important, her character. This is a skilled, brave, patriotic woman who will serve our country with distinction in this most critical post. Her dedication to our country throughout her life is complete, and that is why I will be proud to cast my vote for the confirmation of Gina Haspel, and I urge all Senators to do the same.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate Intelligence Committee voted Gina Haspel's nomination out fa-

vorably by a vote of 10 to 5. It was a strong bipartisan vote. Of course, in just a few minutes, we will vote on her confirmation.

Last week, during her confirmation hearing, she said repeatedly what those of us who had supported her for weeks already knew: She believes that U.S. Government actions must be held to a strict moral standard. If confirmed, she would not obey an order she believed to be unlawful, and in her new role, she pledged not to restart the interrogation programs inside the CIA. Of course, that could not happen without consultation and approval of Congress because the standard has literally changed since the immediate post-9/11 era.

Based on her testimony, her record of service, and her exemplary character, it is clear that the only real option for the Intelligence Committee was to report her out favorably.

Our colleagues on the other side who have objected to this nomination have an opportunity to join a couple of their Members who have already come on over and acknowledged that she is the best qualified nominee in the Agency's history.

Our colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia and vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. WARNER, voted yesterday on Ms. Haspel's behalf. He praised her as an independent voice and found it noteworthy that she would be the first operations officer in more than five decades to lead the Agency.

Generally speaking, you have analysts and you have the case officers who actually handle the cases and do the important intelligence-gathering work from a human intelligence perspective at the Agency, and that is the work she has been involved in for more than 30 years. She would be the first officer in more than five decades to have that sort of experience and the credibility that goes along with it.

The senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, is joined by the senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. MANCHIN, who also sits on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, as well as the junior Senator from North Dakota and others. In other words, there are a number of Democrats now who have decided that it is not in the Nation's best interest to oppose President Trump's nominees just because they happen to be President Trump's nominees.

Now I want to talk about some of the stated objections and why I don't believe they hold any water, but I am glad for this movement in the right direction, which will allow us to confirm her today.

I appreciate all of our colleagues carefully examining Ms. Haspel's records. A number of people I have talked to about the nomination said they wanted to do their due diligence. Well, that is our job, and I don't believe any nominee should be rubberstamped. I know they have reviewed her record, and they have met

with her in person and drawn the only reasonable conclusion, I believe, which is that she is well qualified; that she loves the CIA, where she has worked for more than three decades; and that she will provide the Agency's objective, unbiased, and unvarnished intelligence to the President and other policymakers in the Federal Government.

Her loyalty, of course, is not to a political party, after all, because she is nonpartisan, but she owes her loyalty to the American people, whose safety and security she has made her life's work.

Comparisons have rightfully been drawn between the upcoming confirmation vote for Ms. Haspel and the 2013 confirmation vote of John Brennan, former Director of the CIA under President Obama. The vast majority of Democrats had no problem voting for Mr. Brennan, and so I believe they should have no problem voting for Ms. Haspel because, first of all, Mr. Brennan supports her. Of course, he was the No. 4 person at the CIA during this period post-9/11 when the rendition, detention, and interrogation programs were carried out in full compliance with then-stated law from the highest legal authority available, the Office of Legal Counsel. We have also seen others in the Obama administration support Ms. Haspel as well.

I have said it before, and I will say it again: Those people who know Ms. Haspel best, who have worked alongside of her on a daily basis in undisclosed locations around the world, doing the Nation's important work, like this woman, admire her, respect her, and think she is the best of the best.

I speak for many when I say that we appreciate Ms. Haspel's willingness and desire to serve in this new and never-easy capacity. I hope we can confirm her in short order so she can get back to work and continue to do the work that she loves and that our Nation needs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Senate has often been called the world's greatest deliberative body, where we can thoroughly and respectfully debate weighty matters, regardless of pressures imposed by any given moment. While we do not always live up to this ideal, it is one for which we should always strive. The Constitution entrusts us with the task of serving as a check against the executive branch, providing our advice and—if appropriate—our consent to the Executive's nominees to lead our government's most critical agencies. During my time here, at its best, the Senate can be and actually should be the conscience of the Nation.

So as we move to vote on the nomination of Gina Haspel, with very little debate and gaping holes in her record, I fear the Senate is failing to fulfill its basic duty to provide advice and informed consent to her nomination. Re-

member, we are supposed to advise and consent, and worse yet, we are failing in our duty to serve as the Nation's conscience.

Now much of what is publicly known about Ms. Haspel's role in the CIA is disturbing. To begin with—and I have listened to Senators on both sides—I do not question Ms. Haspel's commitment to our country or to our national security that, I think, she has established. But what I question is her judgment and her fidelity to a core value of our Nation: that all people have certain inalienable rights. Underlying these inalienable rights is our belief in the basic dignity of human beings, a dignity that is incompatible with inhumane practices like torture. Torture should never be part of America's way of leading the world.

During the height of the CIA's torture program, Ms. Haspel ran one of the Agency's most notorious "black sites" in Thailand. There, under her leadership, brutal torture techniques were employed. From available accounts, according to that which has been made public, this included waterboarding detainees, slamming them against walls, and confining them in coffin-shaped boxes for extended periods of time.

At the time, there was a benign euphemism for this treatment. It was called "enhanced interrogation techniques." But we know better. This wasn't "enhanced interrogation techniques." This was government-sanctioned torture, pure and simple. Torture is immoral. Torture is inhumane. Frankly, torture is un-American. I agree with our colleague Senator JOHN MCCAIN—he is one who speaks with a distinct moral clarity on this issue—that Ms. Haspel's refusal to condemn torture as immoral is disqualifying. For that reason alone, I cannot, in good conscience, support her nomination.

But it is worse than that. Ms. Haspel also reportedly advocated for destroying the videotapes of these torture sessions—now, that was against the advice of the CIA's own lawyers. More than that, it was in contravention of a Federal judicial order requiring that they be preserved. The CIA's former general counsel said Ms. Haspel was one of the "staunchest advocates . . . for destroying the tapes." Notwithstanding the advice of the CIA's lawyer, notwithstanding the federal judicial order, she claimed that destroying the tapes was necessary to protect the security of CIA officers conducting these interrogations.

But that explanation withers under even the slightest scrutiny. If that were really the concern, then the CIA could easily have copied the tapes with the officers' faces blacked out and only then destroyed the originals. All of us are used to seeing news items with the faces of certain witnesses and others blacked out. Nor do we have access to the only independent account of Ms. Haspel's role in the destruction of the

tapes—the Justice Department's Durham Report. I joined nine Senators on the Judiciary Committee in a request for access to the Durham Report, but our request has not been accommodated. As a result, we will not know the full story of the tapes' destruction before we are asked to vote on Ms. Haspel's nomination today.

This is just what we know through public reports. There is much more the American people don't know about Ms. Haspel's actions because it remains classified. The American people have been kept in the dark in part because Ms. Haspel herself has been responsible for what information about her record is declassified. It is a brazen conflict of interest that Ms. Haspel can decide what to release and what to conceal about her past. The CIA has declassified glowing facts about Ms. Haspel's work with Mother Teresa, but refuses to disclose basic information that would shed light on her past actions and what values would guide her as CIA director. This process has been reduced to a farce.

I have reviewed classified materials on Ms. Haspel's long career at the CIA, and I find these materials to be deeply disturbing. I am not able to discuss any of the details revealed in these materials, again, because Ms. Haspel has decided to keep them cloaked by classification. Candidly, I do not believe a Senator can provide his or her informed consent to this nominee without first reviewing these materials.

Now, I recognize, and I must say I appreciate, that Ms. Haspel has committed to not allowing the CIA to resurrect the use of torture if she is confirmed. I also recognize that that commitment, while commendable, is not optional. Torture is illegal; that is simply what the law demands.

But what about the next immoral action that this President might ask her to commit? Should we trust that she will have the moral compass to stand up and say "no"? Based on what we have seen, I do not.

The world is watching closely today. Our allies and our enemies—and our own future generations—will view this vote as nothing less than a referendum on torture. If the Senate—this body that I cherish—gives its blessing to a nominee who is synonymous with the CIA's interrogation program, then the demons of our past—from Abu Ghraib to the CIA's black sites—may haunt us anew.

I do not believe that this blight on our history represents who we are or what we stand for. I really do not believe that this is the soul of America. But it is a terrible mistake. I believe we must clearly demonstrate that we are capable of learning from and moving beyond our darker chapters as a nation. If we make a mistake, we should admit it and take steps not to have it happen again. For that reason, I will vote no on Ms. Haspel's nomination.

Mr. President, I do not see another Senator seeking recognition.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today—

(Disturbance in the Visitors' Galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Chamber.

The Sergeant at Arms will restore order in the Chamber.

(Disturbance in the Visitors' Galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will restore order in the Chamber.

The Senator from Arizona.

ZTE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today disturbed by the President's recent decision to consider easing penalties placed on the Chinese telecommunications company ZTE.

Looking at ZTE's history of deception and dishonest business practices, it is deeply troubling to see these penalties cast aside so carelessly in pursuit of what appears to be a type of chaotic diplomatic improvisation that has become standard operating procedure with the administration.

Let me briefly outline ZTE's past actions in order to refresh everyone's memory on how the company came to face such serious punitive measures.

In 2016, the U.S. Department of Commerce concluded an exhaustive investigation, finding that ZTE had knowingly sold products made with American technology to Iran, North Korea, and other countries banned from receiving such technologies. ZTE violated these sanctions and engaged in a deliberate attempt to cover it up.

Once ZTE's deception was uncovered, the Obama administration announced imminent implementation of export restrictions that would deprive ZTE of American technology crucial to the manufacturing of its products.

The threat of sanctions brought ZTE to agree to settle the matter, and one year later, ZTE signed a settlement, which included more than \$1 billion in fines, the creation of audit and compliance requirements to avoid future violations, and a promise to punish those individuals involved in past violations.

Last month, after ZTE was found to have violated the terms of the settlement and to have then sought to deceive the U.S. Government about those violations, the Commerce Department announced a 7-year ban on the export of U.S. components to ZTE.

In essence, ZTE has repeatedly engaged in malign activity by deliberately misleading the government for years, all while attempting to deliver American technologies into the hands of State sponsors of terrorism. The in-

stinct to punish ZTE for this behavior was the right one.

So it was puzzling to hear, as we did this past Sunday, that the President instructed the Commerce Department to find a way to ease that punishment. First the President tweeted that the restrictions needed to be eased because they would cost China too many jobs.

It now appears that this concession is part of a deal that, if reached, would have the Chinese Government agree to remove tariffs on U.S. agricultural products. It must be noted that these are the same tariffs that China levied in retaliation for the steel and aluminum tariffs announced, and now being haphazardly applied, by this administration.

Make no mistake, what we are witnessing here is a nascent trade war—tariffs leading to tariffs leading to ill-advised concessions, haphazard exemptions, and so on and so on. Meanwhile, businesses suffer from increased uncertainty, our national security is threatened, and international allies find themselves dealing with an American foreign policy characterized only by chaos and unpredictability.

Punitive measures like sanctions work only when they are consistently executed. How is any other nation meant to take threats of U.S. sanctions seriously when we enforce them some of the time and toss them aside other times when we feel like it? What does such unpredictability say to our allies about our ability to lead on global issues and our reliability as a partner in the future?

We are making a mockery of the rules-based international order that we helped establish. Our foreign policy, whether it relates to trade or security, must be characterized by stability and predictability, not confusion and chaos.

We are at our best when our allies and our adversaries know where we stand. Let us return to that standard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the Haspel nomination occur at this time; further, that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate immediately vote on the nomination; and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Gina Haspel, of Kentucky, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, James Lankford, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, John Hoeven, David Perdue, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, James E. Risch, John Thune, Todd Young, Ron Johnson, Cory Gardner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Gina Haspel, of Kentucky, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 100 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Nelson
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Collins	Hoeven	Rubio
Corker	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott
Cotton	Isakson	Shaheen
Crapo	Johnson	Shelby
Cruz	Kennedy	Sullivan
Daines	Lankford	Thune
Donnelly	Lee	Tillis
Enzi	Manchin	Toomey
Ernst	McConnell	Warner
Fischer	Moran	Wicker

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Harris	Paul
Bennet	Hassan	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Jones	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	

NOT VOTING—2

McCain Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Haspel nomination?

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 101 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Gardner	Nelson
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Corker	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Isakson	Shaheen
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Crapo	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tillis
Donnelly	Manchin	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Harris	Paul
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Brown	Hirono	Sanders
Cantwell	Jones	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	King	Smith
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Udall
Duckworth	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Flake	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 608.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dana Baiocco, of Ohio, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2017.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Dana Baiocco, of Ohio, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2017.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, Ron Johnson, Mike Rounds, Lindsey Graham, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, James E. Risch, John Thune, Todd Young, John Hoeven, Cory Gardner, David Perdue.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

VETERANS CEMETERY BENEFIT CORRECTION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand the Senate has received a message from the House to accompany S. 2372.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 2372.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 2372) entitled "An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes," do pass with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to S. 2372.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the motion to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 2372, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes.

Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, John Cornyn, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Jerry Moran, Joni Ernst, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, John Hoeven, Bill Cassidy, Dan Sullivan.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2246

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 2372, with a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to S. 2372 with an amendment numbered 2246.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.
"This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2247 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2246

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2247 to amendment No. 2246.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days"

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2248

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to refer the House message on S. 2372 to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to report back forthwith with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer the House message to accompany S. 2372 to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 2248.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.
 "This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2249

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2249 to the instructions of the motion to refer.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "3 days" and insert "4 days"

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2250 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2249

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2250 to amendment No. 2249.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "4" and insert "5"

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 670.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of five years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of five years.

Mike Crapo, John Thune, Pat Roberts, David Perdue, Michael B. Enzi, Lamar Alexander, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, James M. Inhofe, Mike Rounds, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Tim Scott, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 672.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of six years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of six years.

Mike Crapo, John Thune, Pat Roberts, David Perdue, Michael B. Enzi, Lamar Alexander, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Tim Scott, James M. Inhofe, John Hoeven, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 618.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Randolph Evans, of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of James Randolph Evans, of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

Thom Tillis, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Ron Johnson, Cory Gardner, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, James E. Risch, Todd Young, John Hoeven, Mike Rounds, David Perdue.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

VETERANS CEMETERY BENEFIT CORRECTION ACT—Continued

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls with respect to the cloture motions filed in executive session today be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Indiana.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, as we observe National Police Week, I rise today to honor our fallen law enforcement officers and to discuss some of the ways we are working to make it safer for officers to do their jobs and protect our communities.

Together, we honor and remember the lives of the law enforcement officers we have lost in the line of duty. These men and women put their lives on the line to protect our neighborhoods so that a Hoosier senior can safely sit on his porch and watch his grandkids play in the front yard or to ensure that working families can go to and from their jobs in peace. They are on the frontlines battling the devastating opioid epidemic that has plagued our State. Our police are the ones who work with our communities and local leaders to help stem violence and to help fight crime in our neighborhoods. They are the ones putting themselves in harm's way every single day.

These officers are heroes. To their families, they are even more. They are moms and dads, sisters and brothers, wives and husbands, and their families pray that they come home safely at the end of every shift. Sadly, as we know, that doesn't happen every time.

When we lose an officer, that loss is felt deeply, particularly by their family and those who know them and love them. It is a grief that is also shared throughout the entire law enforcement community and throughout our State.

Since I began serving in the U.S. Senate in 2013, the Hoosier State has lost nine officers in the line of duty. I want to take a moment to pay tribute to these fallen heroes.

In September of 2013, Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department officer Rod Bradway was shot and killed while responding to a domestic dispute call in a northwest Indianapolis apartment complex. A veteran officer, he had served with the Wayne Township Fire Department for 10 years before working for 5 years on the IMPD force. Officer Bradway is credited with saving the life of a domestic dispute victim and her baby before losing his life protecting them.

In June 2014, Tipton County deputy sheriff Jacob Calvin was killed in a car crash while responding to an accident. Deputy Calvin served his community and our country in more ways than one. He was with the department for 2½ years and had previously served his country in Iraq in the U.S. Air Force and volunteered at the Kempton Fire Department as a firefighter and EMT.

In July 2014, Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department officer Perry Renn was responding to reports of gunfire when he was shot and killed. Officer Renn served more than two decades in the force. He was a two-time recipient of the IMPD's Medal of Bravery Award, and he was awarded the Medal of Honor and Purple Heart posthumously. Officer Renn was also a U.S. Army veteran.

Also, in July of 2014, Patrolman Jeffrey Westerfield of the Gary Police Department was found fatally shot while on duty in his patrol car. He was killed on his 47th birthday. Patrolman Westerfield had served the Gary Police Department for 19 years and, prior to that, in the U.S. Army.

In September of 2014, Merrillville Police Department patrolman Nickolaus Schultz was shot when investigating reports concerning an evicted tenant. Patrolman Schultz passed away 2 days later due to his wounds. Patrolman Schultz was only 24 years old and had been on the Merrillville police force for 13 months.

In March of 2016, we lost Howard County sheriff's deputy Carl Koontz, who was shot and killed while serving arrest and search warrants in Russiaville in connection with a narcotics case. Deputy Koontz was just 26 years old. He had served more than 2 years with the Howard County Sheriff's Department.

In July of 2017, Lieutenant Aaron Allen of the Southport Police Department was shot while responding to a crash involving an overturned vehicle. Hours before he was killed—and there is a picture of this which tears your heart out—he walked his 5-year-old son to the bus for his first day of kindergarten. He was a 6-year veteran with the Southport Police Department and had previously been named the Officer of the Year for saving two Hoosiers' lives. He also previously served in the U.S. Air Force.

Tragically, this year we have lost two Hoosier police officers in the line of duty. Boone County deputy sheriff Jacob Pickett was shot and killed in March during a vehicle pursuit in Lebanon, IN. As the suspect fled on foot, Deputy Pickett and Brick, his K-9 partner, followed in pursuit. Deputy Pickett was shot as he rounded the corner of a building. He served with the Boone County Sheriff's Office for 3 years and previously with the Tipton County Sheriff's Office and the Marion County Sheriff's Office.

Earlier this month, just a few weeks ago, Terra Haute police officer Rob Pitts was shot and killed while investigating a homicide. As Officer Pitts and other detectives approached the suspect's apartment, the suspect opened fire, fatally injuring Officer Pitts. Officer Pitts had served with the department for 16 years and with the Sullivan Police Department for 6 years prior to that.

These nine brave officers embodied values that should make their loved ones, their fellow officers, and every Hoosier incredibly proud. We remember their sacrifice and their courageous service, and we are thinking of their families, not only today, not only this week, but year round.

As we pay our respects to those we have lost, we also have a solemn duty to support the family members of those officers who never had the chance to return home. We also must work to ensure that our officers and law enforcement agencies have the resources needed to do their jobs and keep our communities safe. Over the last few years, I have been honored to introduce and to get signed into law bipartisan legislation to help support law enforcement agencies and officers and to help with

grant efforts to provide our officers with necessary tools.

When officers and first responders are killed in the line of duty, they often leave behind beloved families, including school-age children. These families and children endure grief and trauma that we can't even begin to imagine. We must do all we can to help the families of our fallen officers and first responders, and this includes ensuring that their children get a good education. That is why I helped to introduce the bipartisan Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act. This allows the children of fallen first responders who pursue a college education to have access to the maximum level of Federal Pell grants authorized by law.

I was pleased to support the government funding bill that passed in March, which included a provision based on the Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act.

Another critically important area we must continue to focus on is helping to equip officers with lifesaving equipment. It is no secret that our officers may face dangerous situations at any moment as they respond to calls and do their job. That is why I supported the bipartisan Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act. It was signed into law in May of 2016. It helps law enforcement agencies purchase bulletproof vests. Having those vests can prevent injuries for our law enforcement officers and can save lives.

We experienced this firsthand in 2014, when IMPD officer Greg Milburn was shot in the line of duty. He credits his vest with his survival. In the past 3 years, police departments across Indiana have received a total of more than \$1 million to help purchase bulletproof vests for officers so they can all go home at the end of their shift every day.

Another essential role law enforcement officers play is working with our community leaders, elected leaders, and law enforcement agencies to tackle persistent crime and to improve neighborhood safety. I, along with many of my colleagues, have long supported robust funding for the Byrne Memorial JAG Program. This supports State and local law enforcement agencies in their efforts to address the specific public safety and criminal justice challenges facing our communities. This program also supports information sharing on terror and criminal threats, drug and human trafficking organizations, and sexual predators.

Lastly, as officers go to work every day, they can encounter horrific scenes and experience traumatic situations that are just impossible to leave behind once the day is done. Last year, I authored and introduced the bipartisan Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act with my friend and colleague from Indiana, Senator TODD YOUNG. Our bill was signed into law by President Trump in January. It helps law enforcement agencies enhance or

establish mental health services for officers. It provides tools to help officers deal with mental health challenges and to combat the stigma associated with addressing those issues. This legislation also includes funding that the Department of Justice can use to initiate peer-mentoring pilot program grants for local law enforcement agencies.

Our law enforcement officers deserve our support. They deserve it to ensure they can do their job safely and effectively. I will continue to work on bipartisan efforts to help our officers and their families.

In the meantime, this National Police Week—this special week we have here every year—let's take a moment to pray for those fallen heroes, for their families, and for their fellow officers. They own our hearts for all they do for us. They protect our families, our children, and our communities, and they put their lives on the line every day for us, not knowing if they are going to come home safely or not. But still they go forward. Still they go out. Still our officers who are our friends and who protect us keep us safe every day.

They earned and have always kept all of our respect and of everyone in our communities. They have our love. They have our devotion and our deepest appreciation for everything they do every day.

May God bless all of these officers. May God bless Indiana, and may God bless the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

MCCAIN MISSION ACT

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, many of us this afternoon had the opportunity to see a screening of the HBO documentary "For Whom the Bell Tolls," a tribute to Senator McCain. It is clearly a tribute, but it is also the story of his life and an expose of his sacrifice for his country. It is a moving story of Senator McCain's life and an inspiration to me and, I assume, to my colleagues for the commitment that he has made to always try to do right—putting his country above self.

I have had the honor of working with Senator McCain for the last several years in regard to legislation trying to improve the circumstances that our Nation's veterans face as they access healthcare within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Senator McCain and I introduced legislation to accomplish a number of things related to this, particularly the Veterans Choice Program. Choice was passed back about 2014, at a time in which the VA was in a crisis and a time in which the veterans they were created to serve were harmed by decisions made at the Department of Veterans Affairs. The problems were highlighted in Senator McCain's home city of Phoenix at the Phoenix VA, in which a number of veterans may have died as a result of the inability to access healthcare in a timely fashion.

The solution to the problems exhibited in other places across the country—which included false waiting lists, in which the VA had determined a list that was not real but demonstrated that veterans who had no idea they had an appointment to see someone at the VA had an appointment, to camouflage the failures and the slowness of the Department of Veterans Affairs—resulted in a unanimous decision by the Senate to create a program called Choice.

Choice creates the opportunity for a veteran, under certain circumstances, to access healthcare in their home community at the veteran's discretion. This program, in my view, has significant potential to alter the opportunities that a veteran has to be cared for.

Those who served our country deserve the very best, and we want to make certain that happens both inside the VA and with a program that allows veterans to choose healthcare outside the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The Veterans Choice Program has expired since 2014. We have reauthorized it in a number of instances. I think three, perhaps four times. It needed funding, and we reauthorized the funding. Choice was a limited program in which for the veteran to qualify to receive Choice care in the community at their discretion and at their option was determined by whether or not that veteran lived within 40 miles of a VA facility or whether the VA could provide the services within 30 days of the time the veteran needed that care.

The committee here in the Senate has worked for a long time trying to reauthorize the Veterans Choice Program. It has been my position, with Senator McCain, that just to reauthorize Choice would be a significant error on our part and that in the authorization process, we should make community care work better for veterans.

I judge whether or not the VA is providing the care and services that our veterans need by what you would call casework—what we do on behalf of our constituents who have a challenge or a problem with a Federal agency or department. Our casework regarding veterans who are attempting to access care in the community has been exponential.

I checked the other day. At the moment, we have 80 cases for veterans in Kansas—not all related to this particular program but 80 veterans who contacted me and my staff and said: I need your help. Since I have been a Senator, that number is 2,650 veterans who have contacted me or my staff saying: I need your help. So when it came time for the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee to begin the legislative process of determining how to alter the program, how to reform it, and, particularly, how to extend the program, I wanted to make certain that my input was based upon what veterans were telling me about how the program did and didn't work.

Our committee passed a bill out of the Veterans' Affairs Committee

months ago. That bill was passed by our committee on a vote of 14 to 1. I was the one opponent. I say that for my colleagues today—some of whom have asked my view, some of whom I hope were interested in my view, and even those who may not care. I want them to know that the bill now in front of the Senate—and the majority leader just filed the proceedings for us to have a cloture vote next week on this legislation—is legislation I support. It does do something more than just extend Choice. It creates opportunities for that program to work much better. Most importantly to me was the issue of who decides whether or not a veteran has the option of choosing community care.

The legislation that we will consider next week allows for the Department of Veterans Affairs—in a sense, the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs—to remain the gatekeeper. The VA has the opportunity to make the decision about who gets to have community care, but different than today, when the only criteria is 40 miles or 30 days. We create access standards in this legislation that the VA must abide by in determining whether or not a veteran can have care in the community, and that is a significant difference.

We had all kinds of challenges with the 40 miles and 30 days. We changed the definition of what a facility was in order to get the VA to allow individuals to have access to care at home. People may recall that the VA wanted to count the 40 miles as the crow flies. In addition to other challenges that the VA put in front of veterans, we have eliminated those and created a standard by which the VA must abide. So while the gatekeeper remains the Department of Veterans Affairs, it is not in the total discretion of the Department of Veterans Affairs. They must abide by criteria, and if the veteran believes he or she is denied care in the community, that veteran has the opportunity to appeal based upon a number of standards, including best medical interest of the veteran.

We are changing a program in which the VA made decisions that often denied veterans the access to care in their community that veteran asked for, and we are saying: You now asked the VA for permission. The VA has to make a decision to grant or deny that permission, but they can't do it solely at the discretion of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. They must abide by criteria. That is a significant improvement.

Secondly, if you feel like you have received the wrong decision, you can appeal that decision.

Today—and we have plenty of examples of this in Kansas—when a veteran is denied community care by the Department of Veterans Affairs, their only appeal is to their Senator or their Member of Congress, in which we then have a new case to once again try to work our way through the Department

of Veterans Affairs: Why did you deny this veteran his or her choice to have community care?

This bill is a significant improvement. It satisfies the concerns I had; my view that early on, we were mostly just trying to extend Choice as it was—as it is, and now this replaces it with really a circumstance in which veterans have rights, have standards the Department of Veterans Affairs must comply with.

In addition to the issues of who can access care, who is the gatekeeper, and determining the standards, this bill merges and modernizes all community care programs and puts them all in one category at the Department of Veterans Affairs instead of multiple programs. It simplifies it.

We have had too many instances in which, if you didn't access care under one program, you might be able to apply for another. This changes the circumstances that so many of my veterans have complained to me about, in which they get an authorization from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and they are allowed to see a physician in their home community, but then when they need lab work or an x ray—something that should be related to that visit—they have to go back to the Department of Veterans Affairs to get additional consent. This is more in the line of necessary procedures that should follow: one authorization that includes the things that are medically necessary for that appointment with the physician or that admission to a hospital. It just makes sense that these other things would be necessary if that physician whom the VA referred you to believes them to be necessary. It establishes a framework for the VA to build a high-performing healthcare network, and it implements new coordination so the veteran and the VA work together to determine what is in the best interest of that veteran.

It is something I have cared about a lot. We required that in the original Choice Act; that the healthcare provider be paid Medicare rates. Those of us who come from rural States recognize there are various rates under Medicare, and for our smallest hospitals, they are entitled to cost-based reimbursement. That is not happening under the current legislation, the law today. This legislation corrects the problem, keeping the circumstance more likely in which our hospitals and doctors would be financially able to see a veteran and provide that care.

This is not privatizing the VA. The VA serves a valuable and useful role. Many veterans choose to have care at the Department of Veterans Affairs, at their hospitals, and at their clinics. Again, it is the veterans' choice where he or she wants to go.

For those of us who come from rural places, the distances in which a veteran must travel, in many instances, have eliminated the ability for that veteran to ever access care from the VA. The VA has programs that are im-

portant to veterans—traumatic brain injury, amputation, things that may not ever be as available or as desirable in the community.

This legislation is supported by every veterans service organization I know of. We have come to the point in which it is time for us to pass this legislation. Memorial Day is approaching. The President has asked this legislation be approved prior to Memorial Day. We think it is appropriate to honor those who served our country at this point in May, where Memorial Day is around the corner, to provide the care they are asking for.

The other aspect of why it is important for us to move on the legislation now is that the funding for Choice and community care has diminished. I serve on the Appropriations Committee that funds the Department of Veterans Affairs, and it is necessary for us to get the money in place. The VA is already rationing care for those veterans who use Choice today, and this legislation puts the necessary dollars in place for Choice to continue in its new reformed and improved status.

It would be a shame for us to miss this opportunity. It would be wrong for our veterans. It would diminish the number of people who access care at the Department of Veterans Affairs and do so at a time in which the needs are great for those who have served our Nation.

Again, referring to my colleague from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, we would honor him if we answer this call to do our duty to see that our veterans are cared for, that promises are kept.

I appreciate the response that was given when the bill was suggested to be named in honor of Senator MCCAIN. Both the House chairman and the House committee, along with Senator ISAKSON, the chairman here, and Senator TESTER, the ranking member, have agreed to do that. This legislation is now known as the McCain Mission Act. Our colleague, for whom there are so many reasons to pay honor and tribute to, would receive another honor for his service to our Nation but of equal importance, his service to other veterans.

For so many reasons, it is time for us to act, to pass the McCain Mission Act, and do so with the promptness that has followed long deliberations to try to get it right.

In my view, too often the U.S. Senate, the Congress, politics, and government, in general, just put a bandaid on to get by. This legislation is significantly different than doing something to get by. It would improve the quality of life for those who serve our Nation. We should honor them, as we honor Senator MCCAIN, prior to Memorial Day, at the end of next week.

I thank you for the opportunity to address the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I want to first commend my colleague

from Kansas for his passion for our veterans and for his hard work on legislation that is really going to help in Ohio and around the country to ensure they have the care they deserve and also for his mention of Senator MCCAIN, who is a true national hero. He now has a documentary about him on HBO, as some of us saw earlier today. It will soon be available for everyone to see. It is very powerful.

STOP ACT

Madam President, we heard earlier from one of my colleagues from Indiana who talked about the fact that this is National Police Week. A number of us have come to the floor to talk about our incredible men and women in uniform back home who protect us every day through their dedication, their public service, and it is appropriate to commend them.

I will say, as I have talked to police officers from Ohio this week, one issue came up again and again that doesn't get the attention it deserves; that is, the influx of synthetic opioids, like fentanyl, and the effect it is having on our law enforcement community, our first responders, in general, and, for that matter, all of our citizens. What they told me is, this is the issue that is creating so much crime in our communities. This is the issue that is filling our courtrooms and our jails.

One police officer I met with this week is a corrections officer at a jail in one of our urban areas in Ohio. I asked him to just give me an estimate. What percentage of the inmates in this jail are there because of the drug crisis and specifically the opioid issue?

He thought for a minute, and he said: Probably 90 percent—90 percent. Some are there because of selling drugs, some of them are there, though, because they have committed a crime while they were trying to get the money to be able to pay for their habit—so it is shoplifting; it is fraud; it is burglary. This issue is now everywhere.

The last year for which we have good information would be 2016. We have a lot of information nationally on that, and 2016 was the worst year on record in terms of overdose deaths attributable to these synthetic drugs coming into our country. Guess what. Almost certainly, 2017 is worse.

As one example, the coroner for Franklin County, OH—that is the Columbus area in Ohio, our fastest growing city—recently released their 2017 overdose report for the county. Franklin County had 520 overdose deaths in 2017. That is a 47-percent increase from 2016. So 2016 was the worst year on record; 2017, almost a 50-percent increase in overdose deaths. By the way, sadly, those overdose deaths are on track again this year to reach a record.

Two-thirds of those overdose deaths in Columbus, OH, Franklin County, involve fentanyl, which is this synthetic opioid that is overtaking our communities in Ohio. Think about that. Two-thirds of those overdose deaths last year in Columbus, OH, were due to fentanyl.

Just last week, a Cleveland man was sentenced to more than 11 years in Federal prison for selling fentanyl that resulted in a 46-year-old Ohio man's death. Earlier this month, a man in Lorain, OH, was convicted of selling fentanyl, resulting in a 23-year-old's death.

This drug and the opioid crisis knows no bounds. It is in every age group. It is in every ZIP Code. It is everywhere.

Unbelievably, this fentanyl drug—a synthetic form of heroin, a synthetic form of opioids—we are told by the experts is coming into our country through the U.S. mail system. This is shocking to me, and it should be something we can do something about. This is a Federal agency, after all.

Unlike other drugs—let's say heroin or even crystal meth, which tend to come over land, mostly from Mexico—this drug primarily is coming through the U.S. mail system from one country primarily—China. It is coming from laboratories in China, where some evil scientist is mixing this deadly brew and then sending it through the U.S. mail into our communities. It is being shipped directly into your community in small packages. These are the deadliest drugs we have ever experienced, and they are being shipped directly through a Federal agency.

What is fentanyl? It is 50 times more powerful than heroin. It is inexpensive. It is readily available now in many communities. It is the new scourge, killing more people in my State of Ohio last year than any other drug. We need to do all we can to stop more of these poisons from entering our communities. At the very least, if we can't stop it all, let's raise the price because the cost of this drug, being so inexpensive and it being so powerful, is one of the things that is driving these overdoses and these deaths.

It is not just overdoses. It is people whose lives are getting off track, families breaking apart, community dysfunction, people leaving work. It is the babies who are being born with this neonatal absence syndrome, so they have to go through withdrawal as little babies whom you can hold in your two hands. It is affecting our communities in so many ways.

There is a new study out showing that of the men who are out of the workforce altogether—probably 8½ million men—roughly half of them are taking pain medication on a daily basis. When pushed, two-thirds say it is prescriptions. What does that mean? This means it is affecting one of the big issues we are all hearing about back home, which is lack of a workforce. Well, here you have millions of Americans who are off track because of this issue. So, yes, it is tragic and unbelievable that over 60,000 Americans a year are dying from overdoses, but it is even worse than that. That is the tip of the iceberg, in a way. There are so many other aspects of this that are affecting the communities we represent in the Chamber.

With regard to fentanyl, this new scourge, we conducted an 18-month investigation in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair. We did this because we are hearing more and more about fentanyl. We wanted to look into how fentanyl is being shipped into the United States and what can be done at the Federal level to stop it. The investigation revealed just how easy it is to purchase fentanyl online and have it shipped to the United States. It is so easy, in fact, we found that most of the overseas providers essentially guaranteed delivery if you use the U.S. mail system.

Through a simple Google search, our staff found hundreds of websites, many affiliated with Chinese labs openly advertising fentanyl for sale.

We went undercover, using an investigator from the Department of Homeland Security to help us find some of these websites. We found that in several cases—seven different cases—individuals who receive fentanyl through some of these websites had died from an overdose shortly after receiving their fentanyl. We were able to find that the sellers would tell you to ship the drugs through the Postal Service, not a private carrier like FedEx or DHL or UPS or any other private carrier. As we have learned in our investigation, this is because the Postal Service, unlike these private carriers, is not required to have what is called advanced electronic data as part of the package. In other words, law enforcement is not given information on these packages.

The data that is in this advance electronic information is the name and address of the sender, the name and address of the person who is receiving the package, and what the contents of the package are. How does this help? Well, this gives law enforcement the ability to use big data to find out what region it is coming from—again, if there is a region in China that is sending a lot of this poison, they will know that; where it is going; if it is going to a particular post office box where they have reason to believe that it might be suspect, or perhaps it is going to an abandoned warehouse.

The information about what is in the package obviously is very interesting to Customs and Border Protection. They need this help. Why? Because they can't otherwise identify suspicious packages. There are 900 million packages a year now coming into the United States through the mail system—900 million packages. It is like finding a needle in a haystack.

Yes, we need better detection equipment, and we have actually passed legislation recently do to that. We have additional legislation to be able to hire more individuals to help detect whether these packages have opioids contained within them. But this advance information that you can have on the package is so incredibly important, and it is the reason the traffickers are saying: Don't send it through a private

carrier; send it through our own government agency because we think we can guarantee delivery there. It is a glaring loophole in our screening process, and it is a national security threat. It is a clear example of where Congress ought to come together on a bipartisan basis and enact Federal policies to fix this flaw.

Shortly after the tragic events of 9/11—September 11, 2001—Congress did pass a law in this regard, and the law did require all private carriers to obtain advance electronic data on all international packages entering the United States and did require them to share that data with law enforcement. The concern was not just contraband or opioids; it was also explosives. They passed that legislation here in Congress because they knew it was important to have law enforcement get that information.

With regard to the post office, they made it optional. Congress required the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury to determine whether the post office should also collect such data. This was 17 years ago. That determination was never made. They did not follow the law. From one administration to the next, to the next, to the next, there was no determination, which, of course, has resulted in no data requirements for the Postal Service. Again, that was in 2002.

For about 14 years, the Postal Service sat by and did nothing on this issue, knowing that this was a loophole, that this was an opening in the law for traffickers and others to be able to send things into our country. To me, that is unacceptable.

In the last couple of years, after pressure from Congress and, frankly, our investigation that I talked about earlier and the hearings we held talking about this issue in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, the Postal Service did actually start to do what, in my view, they should have done starting 16 years ago, but unfortunately what they are doing is not nearly enough. They have begun getting some data on some international packages, but the efforts are inadequate. One hundred percent of private carriers' packages have to have it, and do, and they provide it to law enforcement.

The U.S. Postal Service last year began an effort to get more of this advance electronic data, but they received it, based on testimony they provided to us, on only about 36 percent of the international packages. This means that the United States received more than 318 million packages last year that had no screening on them, no information for law enforcement to be able to identify the package.

We also found that the quality of the data that was provided by the Postal Service was inadequate in many cases and therefore not helpful to law enforcement. That is again based on testimony before our committee.

Even when the Postal Service conducted a pilot program to screen for

drugs, they only presented 80 percent of the packages targeted by Customs and Border Protection for inspection. So even when they did have information on it and law enforcement said “I want that package”—again, using big data in figuring out what might be a suspicious package—only 80 percent of them were even delivered to law enforcement out of the 36 percent that had electronic data. So the other 20 percent of those suspicious packages were allowed to go into circulation, into our communities, without having any screening.

Frankly, it has been a challenge to get the post office to address this problem on their own. We are talking about 900 million packages a year. And they have funding problems. I get that. But, folks, this is a crisis. It is a true epidemic. It is the No. 1 killer in my State.

It is time for Congress to act. People are dying every day because of these synthetic drugs. How many more of our people have to die before our own Postal Service takes the measures that we know can be taken to stop these poisons?

The STOP Act is a bipartisan bill I introduced with Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR, a Democrat from Minnesota, that will close this loophole and therefore help stop these deadly drugs from entering our communities. Senator KLOBUCHAR was on the floor earlier this afternoon and wanted to speak at this time about the legislation. She had to catch a plane to get back to her home State of Minnesota, but I appreciate her partnership on this issue and her promotion of our dealing with this issue here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

The STOP Act is very simple, and it is common sense. It is going to hold the U.S. Postal Service to the same standard as these private mail carriers that we talked about and require that they get advance electronic data not on 36 percent but on 100 percent of packages entering the United States—and good data—and then present that to law enforcement.

We are not punishing the Postal Service or forcing them to jump through unnecessary hoops. We are simply saying that, given the crisis we face, the U.S. Postal Service, a Federal agency, should require the same types of advance electronic data from foreign countries that private mail carriers do, and we give the Postal Service a year to do it.

By the way, when I talked to mail carriers about this issue, when I talked to postal inspectors about this issue, certainly when I talked to Customs and Border Protection individuals about this issue, they all agreed. Who wouldn't? They have families too. They understand. This issue needs to be addressed, and it needs to be addressed urgently.

The United States of America provides this advance electronic data on 90 percent of our packages that we send

to other countries, so we are not asking for something that we are not doing. It makes sense all around the world. It makes sense here, and it will help save lives.

Thirty-three of my Senate colleagues—20 Republicans, 12 Democrats, and 1 Independent—have signed on as cosponsors of this legislation. The Presiding Officer today, who is from West Virginia—her State has been getting hit really hard like Ohio. She has a passion for this issue. She knows that we need to do all we can do to stop this poison from coming in.

The legislation has the support of a broad cross-section of this body. It has also been endorsed by President Trump's opioid commission. This is a commission that he formed to look at answers, and this is one of their specific recommendations: The STOP Act—pass it.

Just this week, the Secretary of Homeland Security, Kirstjen Nielsen, reaffirmed her support for this measure.

The House companion bill has 271 cosponsors—more than half of the U.S. House of Representatives.

By the way, asking every country for this kind of information, this advance electronic data, is not just common sense, it is also reasonable. The United States provides that data on nearly all of our packages that go into China, as an example, so why shouldn't China do that for us? At least one country—Sweden—recently returned packages from China that did not comply with Swedish postal rules on providing this information. So the Postal Service's argument that they have to accept and deliver packages from foreign posts under treaty obligations is simply not the case. If a country doesn't play by our rules, we can simply choose to return their packages. By the way, threatening to do so is all we need to do because these countries then will comply. We have the largest market in the world. We are the biggest economy in the world. We just have to insist on it.

China is already starting to recognize the importance of providing this data for access to U.S. markets. For example, as of early this year, when we published our report from the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, we had information that China had already provided electronic data on roughly 50 percent of the packages headed to the United States. So this notion that somehow China can't do it—of course they can.

Yesterday, instead of marking up this bipartisan STOP Act I talked about, the STOP Act legislation, the House Ways and Means Committee considered a weaker alternative to our bill. Apparently, they were hearing from some at the Postal Service who don't want Congress to require them to get this electronic data within 1 year, which we think is not just doable but reasonable. They don't want Congress to put in place penalties if they don't get that data, and our legislation, yes, has penalties.

The Postal Service doesn't mind if Congress simply recommends that they get the data, but remember, Congress recommended that way back in 2002. That was 16 years ago. And until very recently, just the last couple of years, the Postal Service did nothing to provide that crucial information.

Unfortunately, the weaker alternative approved by the committee yesterday would eliminate the real, enforceable, and immediate requirement that the Postal Service provide law enforcement with the information they need to identify and stop the shipment of deadly synthetic drugs into our communities.

In particular, the STOP Act requires that within 1 year, the Postal Service secure advance electronic data on 100 percent of packages here in the United States and transmit that data to law enforcement, to Customs and Border Protection. The version reported out yesterday gives the Postal Service 4 years—4 years. Remember the No. 1 killer in my State and in many States. Last year, there was an increase from the year before, and this year looks worse again. We can't wait 4 years. We don't have to.

The version they reported out also requires only 95 percent of the packages to have that data.

In addition, this alternative to the STOP Act that was reported out yesterday actually gives the Federal Government the authority to waive the requirements in the STOP Act that would get advance electronic data if it is in the “national security interest of the United States.” They can waive it altogether. I am struggling to think of a time when knowing less about what is coming into our country is in our national security interest.

As the permanent subcommittee investigation's report from January makes clear, there are hundreds of millions of packages coming into this country through the Postal Service every year with little or no screening at all. That is frightening. This loophole is allowing drug traffickers to exploit our own Federal Government, and we can't allow this status quo to continue.

The organization Americans for Securing All Packages—ASAP—issued a statement last week urging the Ways and Means Committee to “reject this weakened alternative, and pass the STOP Act, a bill with 271 bipartisan cosponsors.”

Just yesterday, Shatterproof—another addiction advocacy group fighting against the opioid addiction issue—issued a similar statement calling on Congress to pass the STOP Act, not the watered-down version.

I want to say today on the floor that I very much appreciate the fact that Ways and Means Committee Chairman KEVIN BRADY has acknowledged these concerns and has committed to working with us to resolve these differences during the legislative process. I know him. I know he is a passionate advocate of addressing this issue. He wants

to reverse the opioid epidemic, and he wants this to work, so I look forward to working with him.

I particularly appreciate the House coauthors of the STOP Act, including Representatives MIKE BISHOP and BILL PASCRELL. I talked to Mr. BISHOP today, and I know his passion to deal with this issue as well.

The coalition of support for the STOP Act, by the way, also includes the Fraternal Order of Police. I talked about the fact that police officers understand the dangers of this. By the way, to give an example of how dangerous this is to them, it is not just the overcrowding of our prison system and the courts and the crime that is being committed, it is a personal danger to them as law enforcement officers.

In East Liverpool, OH, a police officer pulled over two men for a traffic violation, and he noticed there was a powdery substance in the car. Being alert, he put on his mask and his gloves and arrested those two gentlemen because the powdery substance was fentanyl. They had stupidly tried to spread it around the car. He took them down to the station and booked them.

After he booked them, he was talking to his fellow officers, and he looked down on his shirt and noticed a few white flecks. So, as anyone would do, he took his hand and flicked the pieces of something white off of his shoulder. It was fentanyl. That exposure to his fingers caused him to drop, unconscious, on the floor. This is a big guy, 6 feet 2 inches, over 200 pounds, and in good shape. He overdosed and nearly died.

As his police chief said, if we had not been there to apply Narcan—not once, twice, or three times but five and six times, having taken him to the emergency room—if we hadn't been there, he didn't think he would have made it. Think if he would have gone home to hug his kid without brushing those flecks off his shoulder.

Our police officers are subject to this all the time, as are other first responders. It is appropriate that police organizations around the country are strongly in support of the STOP Act. So are the National Association of State EMS Officials, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and anti-opioid groups like Shatterproof, which I talked about, but also groups like SAFE, or Stop Addiction Fatality Epidemic, and other groups which have said: This is crazy; we have to stop this stuff from coming into our communities and, again, at a minimum, get the price up, because part of the reason it is spreading so much is that it is not just deadly and powerful, but it is inexpensive.

There is a strong bipartisan consensus that this bill, the Senate STOP Act, is absolutely needed to help combat the wave of opioid addiction and overdose deaths on the front end, by keeping some of these more deadly drugs from ever entering our communities in the first place.

This is a step we can take in the Senate to make accessing these deadly and inexpensive synthetic drugs more difficult.

The STOP Act will make life a little easier for the people of Ohio and across the country who are increasingly fatally overdosing or being unknowingly exposed to these deadly drugs.

Of course, this is only one part of combating the opioid epidemic. We understand that. We passed legislation here, which I coauthored, that increases treatment options, does more in terms of prevention, provides longer term recovery, and helps to provide our police officers and other first responders with the Narcan that is needed to reverse the effects of overdoses.

But, to my colleagues, this one is common sense. Stopping more of these deadly drugs from ever entering the country in the first place and raising the price of these drugs will make a difference and will save lives.

Let's pass this legislation. Let's work with the House to be sure it is legislation that will be effective immediately to be able to stop the increasing danger these opioids are causing in our communities all around the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to executive session for consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 593. I ask consent that there be 4 hours of debate, equally divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant informa-

tion is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-37, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Bahrain for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$45 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,
GREGORY M. KAUSNER
(for Charles W. Hooper, Lieutenant
General, USA, Director).

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-37

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Bahrain

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment * \$38 million.
Other \$7 million.

Total \$45 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One thousand five hundred (1,500) MK-82 (500lbs) General Purpose (GP) Bomb Bodies.

Six hundred (600) MK-83 (1,000lbs) GP Bomb Bodies.

Six hundred (600) MK-84 (2,000lbs) GP Bomb Bodies.

Five hundred (500) BLU-109 (2,000lbs) Penetrator Warhead Bomb Bodies.

Non-MDE includes: Also included are spares, and repair parts, support equipment, personnel training and training equipment, shipping and logistics services, publications and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor technical support services, containers, munitions components, test equipment, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (X7-D-AAN).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: May 17, 2018.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Government of Bahrain—Munitions

The Government of Bahrain has requested three thousand two hundred (3,200) General Purpose (GP) and Penetrator Warhead bomb bodies to include: one thousand five hundred (1,500) MK-82 (500lbs) GP bomb bodies, six hundred (600) MK-83 (1,000lbs) GP bomb bodies, six hundred (600) MK-84 (2,000lbs) GP

bomb bodies, and five hundred (500) BLU-109 (2,000lbs) Penetrator Warhead bomb bodies. Also included are spares and repair parts, support equipment, personnel training and training equipment, shipping and logistics services, publications and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor technical support services, containers, munitions components, test equipment, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is \$45 million.

This proposed sale will enhance the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of a major non-NATO ally which is an important security partner in the region. The purchase of these munitions will bolster the Royal Bahraini Air Force's ability to conduct and sustain air operations with its F-16 combat aircraft. Our mutual defense interests anchor our relationship and the Royal Bahraini Air Force plays a significant role in Bahrain's defense.

The proposed sale will improve Bahrain's capability to meet current and future security threats. Bahrain will use these munitions as a deterrent to regional threats, strengthen its homeland defense, and execute counter-terrorism operations. The GP bomb bodies would also better equip Bahrain to operate with U.S.-led and U.S.-supported coalition operations. Bahrain will have no difficulty absorbing these munitions into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

There is no prime contractor planned for this effort; the munitions will be provided by the U.S. Government out of stock. There are no offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. or contractor representatives to Bahrain.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the votes on S. Con. Res. 36, 5-year balanced budget. Had I been present, I would have voted nay on S. Con. Res. 36, 5-year balanced budget.

S. CON. RES. 36

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Budget Committee, I am disappointed that Republican leaders have not even begun the process of debating a budget for the upcoming year in our committee. The United States needs a budget that addresses our national debt, which is increasing significantly faster due to a Republican tax plan that delivers huge windfalls to millionaires, billionaires, and multinational corporations.

Unfortunately, the budget proposal we considered today would take health coverage from tens of millions of Americans because its massive spending cuts would almost certainly mean huge reductions in Medicare and Medicaid. This budget would also make it harder for struggling families to afford food, housing, and childcare, and it

would slash vital economic investments in infrastructure, education, and scientific research.

At the same time, this budget does not achieve even one penny of deficit reduction from reducing the tax cuts that Republicans just provided to those at the top. I will not support a budget that is balanced on the backs of working families and the middle class.

We need a budget that invests in our future, supports a basic standard of living for all Americans, and safeguards our health and safety. This budget proposal fails to do so, which is why I voted against the motion to proceed to its consideration.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to honor the life and memory of Sergeant Sean Gannon of the Yarmouth Police Department, who was killed in the line of duty on April 12, 2018.

This week is National Police Week, a time to honor the brave law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the line of duty. Last month, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts suffered a terrible loss when Sergeant Sean Gannon was killed while serving an arrest warrant in Barnstable. He was only 32 years old.

A native of New Bedford, MA, Sergeant Gannon graduated from Bishop Stang High School in North Dartmouth and then earned a bachelor's degree in criminal justice from Westfield State University and a master's in emergency management from the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

After college, Sergeant Gannon jumped head first into public service, first serving as a public safety officer and later becoming a police officer with the Yarmouth Police Department, where he served for 8 years. Sergeant Gannon loved working with police dogs and was the first full-time K-9 narcotics officer at Yarmouth PD. His loyal patrol dog, Nero, was seriously injured in the incident that claimed Sergeant Gannon's life, but is expected to recover and return to the Gannon family.

Sergeant Gannon had a huge heart and spent his free time volunteering with Big Brothers, Big Sisters, traveling, enjoying the outdoors, and working with his hands.

Thousands of mourners, including law enforcement officers from across the country, gathered to pay their respects at Sergeant Gannon's wake, a testament to the high esteem with which his community held him and to the power of his sacrifice. Yarmouth Police Chief Frank Frederickson called Sergeant Gannon the "Tom Brady of our department" and posthumously promoted him to the rank of sergeant.

Our hearts are broken by the loss of Sergeant Gannon.

Today, we honor Sergeant Gannon's service, we honor his sacrifice, and most importantly, we honor the life he led and the legacy he leaves behind.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the men and women who keep our communities and our country safe as we celebrate National Police Week. This week, we recognize the sacrifices of those who have taken a pledge to continually serve and protect families in Nebraska and across this Nation. Every year, thousands of families, friends, and comrades of fallen officers gather in our Nation's Capital to offer a solemn tribute to law enforcement officers.

Today I wish to pay special tribute to the men and women who protect my home State of Nebraska. These officers risk their own safety for the safety of others. In times of crisis, they run toward danger, not away from it. We are forever indebted to them and so fortunate to have them.

I also would like to express a profound sense of gratitude for those who have fallen in the line of duty.

In 2017, we lost one of our own officers in Nebraska. Omaha Tribal Police Sergeant Curtis Blackbird was responding to a call when his car fatally struck construction equipment while driving through dense fog in the area. Sadly, traffic-related accidents are a leading cause of on-duty law enforcement deaths. Sergeant Blackbird served the Tribal communities in Macy, NE, for over 17 years as a law enforcement officer and earlier as an EMT. His comrades described him as someone special to the law enforcement community and the Tribe's own "personal warrior."

This month will also mark the 3-year anniversary of Officer Kerrie Orozco's death. On May 20, 2015, Officer Orozco was preparing to serve an arrest warrant as a member of the department's metro area fugitive task force. When her team arrived, the suspect opened fire and 29-year-old Kerrie was hit. Tragically, she was on her last day of duty before starting maternity leave to care for her newborn daughter, who had spent months in neonatal intensive care. Kerrie's legacy lives on through her husband, Hector, her daughter Olivia and her two stepchildren.

On National Police Week, we honor fallen officers across our Nation who share a similar story. Our police officers and first responders are a constant reminder of bravery and sacrifice in the face of peril. As we remember them, we also pray for the families of fallen officers who are faced with their own heroic burden.

I am proud to cosponsor the senior Senator from Iowa's Senate resolution commemorating National Police Week. This bipartisan resolution acknowledges the selfless acts of bravery undertaken by law enforcement officers and recognizes the need to ensure our law enforcement officers have the adequate equipment, training, and resources required to safeguard our democracy.

Our men and women in blue serve with valor, dignity, and integrity. For all of our officers who keep our communities safe: Thank you. We are

grateful for all that you do. We know that the weight of what you do every day is heavy, we thank you for your dedication, and we honor your service. May God bless you and your families.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today, during National Police Week, I wish to recognize and honor the men and women who serve as New Jersey's police officers and law enforcement officials. We owe a great debt of gratitude to the professionals working in law enforcement who risk their lives each and every day for the safety of all New Jerseyans. These American heroes answer the call when we need them the most, and we stand together as a grateful nation in saying thank you.

Established by a joint resolution of Congress, National Police Week devotes special appreciation to those members of law enforcement who have lost their lives in the line of duty for the safety and protection of the people they serve. In a proclamation issued 56 years ago, President John F. Kennedy recognized the national importance of honoring our law enforcement professionals by designating the 15th of May as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week in which that date falls as National Police Week.

Today I want to pay special homage to New Jersey's fallen police officers. These heroes made the ultimate sacrifice in service to our State. Though they are no longer with us, we stand proud and united knowing that they continue to be commemorated by their fellow New Jerseyans and by their fellow brothers and sisters in blue. Their courage, spirit of service, and commitment has allowed the people of New Jersey to be safe and secure. For their service and their sacrifice, we are eternally grateful.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, as we observe National Police Week, I rise today to recognize Sean Matthew Suiter and Sander Benjamin Cohen, two Maryland law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the line of duty in 2017. It is important that we give thanks to all the men and women who put themselves at risk every day to protect our communities.

Sean Suiter was an 18-year veteran who was shot in west Baltimore while investigating a triple homicide. Relatives describe him as an anchor in his family, devoted to his wife and three children who "... was focused on trying to [...] raise them to be strong and good citizens."

Sander Cohen, who served as deputy chief in the Maryland Office of the State Fire Marshal was killed in December while assisting a disabled motorist. His friends and family describe him as funny with an infectious smile and as "an example of the good in people."

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I will continue to support programs that provide our law enforcement officers with the funding and training they need to protect themselves and our communities.

Police officers bear a unique burden. While we can never fully repay them for their sacrifices, we should all take the time to thank police officers who put their lives on the line every day to protect our safety. We must honor their sacrifice and support the families of those we have lost in the line of duty.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DR. AROL AUGSBURGER

• Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Dr. Arol Augsburger who will be retiring from his position as the president of the Illinois College of Optometry, ICO, on June 30, 2018. During his 16-year tenure at the ICO, which is located on the near southside of Chicago, the performance of the student body exceeded national averages. This achievement showcases Dr. Augsburger's positive impact on the college. In addition, ICO doubled its investable assets, and its on-campus clinic was able to grow to accommodate over 110,000 visits annually. This on-campus clinic, the Illinois Eye Institute, is the largest safety net provider of eye and vision care in Illinois, and it offers ICO students a unique opportunity for robust clinical training—something that is not available at other institutions.

Prior to Dr. Augsburger's appointment at ICO in 2002, he served for 30 years in a variety of leadership positions in higher education. He served as the interim provost of the University of Alabama at Birmingham, UAB, dean and professor of the UAB School of Optometry, and professor of clinical optometry at the Ohio State University College of Optometry. Dr. Augsburger has also served as president of Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry, the National Board of Examiners in Optometry and the Rotary Club of Chicago, Rotary 1, the world's first Rotary Club and as the immediate-past chairman of the ROTARY/One Foundation. Additionally, Dr. Augsburger served as the 2014-2015 chairman of the board of the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities, on the Near South Planning Board of Chicago, and the Jackson Park Hospital Foundation Board. He was also on the Special Medical Advisory Group of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.

In addition to being named Optometrist of the Year in three States, Dr. Augsburger was named National Doctor of Optometry of the Year and a Distinguished Service Award recipient by the American Optometric Association. In June of 2014, he was inducted into the National Optometry Hall of Fame.

I applaud Dr. Augsburger's commendable work as the president of ICO and in the field of optometry. Students, patients, and Illinois constituents have greatly benefited from his lifetime of commitment to education and optometry.●

REMEMBERING CHRISTOPHER P. STADELMAN

• Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I wish today to honor the life of a West Virginia son and selfless public servant, Christopher P. Stadelman.

After the news that Chris lost his hard-fought, 4-year battle with colon cancer on Friday, May 11, 2018, loved ones and friends from across West Virginia joined in a chorus of sadness for the loss of such a remarkable person, but also thankfulness for the inspiring life he lived.

Chris dedicated his life to serving the people of West Virginia as a journalist and editor at the Charleston Daily Mail, as the co-owner and operator of the Parsons Advocate with his incredible wife, Kelly, and as communications director and chief of staff for Governor Earl Ray Tomblin. Chris said these were his "dream jobs", and he certainly made an enduring impact through each one of them.

Chris and Kelly called two places home: Charleston and Thomas, WV. He is a member of the Marshall University Journalism Hall of Fame and was named a Distinguished West Virginian by Governor Tomblin and an Honorary Mountaineer Brigadier by MG James Hoyer of the West Virginia National Guard.

He loved the news and seemed to always know the latest news well before it broke. He loved debating politics and policy. He loved baseball, especially the Pittsburgh Pirates. He loved his dogs. Above all, he loved Kelly.

When they ran the Parsons Advocate together, Chris would often go to the scene of news and report back to Kelly in the newsroom. For 18 years, they were partners in every sense, and she was his rock as he fought colon cancer with fearless resolve.

During his 4-year battle, on most days, you wouldn't have known Chris was sick. In the Governor's office, he was often the first to arrive in the mornings and the last to leave. After the tragic flooding that took 23 lives in West Virginia in 2016, Chris was tireless in finding ways to help West Virginians recover, even leading the charge to establish a program that has helped people rebuild their homes.

It is because of all of this and so much more that Chris has been surrounded with a family of friends and supporters who proudly proclaim the name Team Stadelman.

I have always been moved by Chris's inspiring life, and my abiding thoughts and prayers are with Kelly; his mom, Nancy; his stepmom, Helen; his siblings, Matt, Jonathan, Philip, and Rachel; and all of Team Stadelman.

Last year, Chris's father, Paul, lost his own battle with cancer. When reflecting on his son's illness, Paul wrote, "So much has been shared. So much has been given. So much has been accomplished."

And for that, West Virginia is so much better.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM "PAT" PATTON GETTY III

• Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor William Patton Getty III for his decades of service to the people of my home State of West Virginia and the surrounding region.

A native of Pittsburgh, PA, Pat has always showcased a passion for giving back to the communities and the people of this special region, and my wife, Gayle, and I are so very proud to call him a dear friend. He has been a part of the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation for more than 24 years, serving as president since 1998 and a trustee since 1994. The foundation serves the people of West Virginia, southwestern Pennsylvania, and the multistate economic region centered on Pittsburgh.

In addition to his role with the foundation, he serves on numerous boards and committees that range from efforts in economic and community development, to policy research, to attracting and retaining diverse talent, to the statewide economic development initiative in West Virginia, called Vision Shared. He was a founding member and past chair of the Fund for the Advancement of Minorities through Education, a past board member of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Western Pennsylvania, a past member of the West Virginia Jobs Cabinet, and served on the advisory board for the West Virginia Teacher Quality Initiative. He also serves on the implementation committee of the Tri-State Shale Coalition, which is a collaborative effort by the Governors of West Virginia, Ohio, and Pennsylvania seeking to optimize downstream economic development pertaining to shale gas and especially modern manufacturing. Since 2006, he has been a leader of Power of 32, a 32-county, four-State economic development project in the Pittsburgh region.

Prior to beginning his role as president of the foundation in 1999, Pat had practiced law with Pittsburgh's firm, Meyer, Unkovic, and Scott for nearly 30 years. In addition to his work at the foundation, Pat has had an unparalleled commitment to advancing educational opportunities for young people and enhancing the quality of life in the region. Countless families have felt the impact of his outstanding efforts and leadership, and he has had a hand in preparing the future leaders of our region to be well-prepared, inspired, and unafraid of creativity, no matter their circumstances.

The people of the region Pat and I share have an exceptional can-do spirit, a neighborly love that is unrelenting, and are grounded by the same core principle: to help others be the best they can be. That is Pat's legacy as a public servant and as a leader, and there is no greater achievement than to be in a position to give back to the communities you love.

While he is retiring and everyone is certain to miss his strong leadership, Pat's dedication and commitment to

excellence will leave a lasting legacy with the countless lives he has touched. Again, I congratulate Pat for his remarkable years of service, and I am honored to wish good health and much happiness to him and his family in the days and years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO KEILAN MCWHORTER

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Keilan McWhorter, the Franklin County Teacher of the Year from Franklin County School in Eastpoint, FL.

Keilan grew up in a small agricultural community in Albany, KY. After graduating from Clinton County High School in 1987, he started college at Gulf Coast Community College, later transferring to Florida State University, graduating in 1992. When at FSU, he completed his teacher training requirements while working on his plant physiology research. Shortly after, Keilan moved to Rickards High School in Tallahassee and completed his student teaching requirements.

Keilan began his first full-time teaching opportunity teaching biology and chemistry at Shanks High School in Quincy. He also served as department chair for 3 years and coached baseball for the Shanks Tigers.

Keilan then moved to Panama City and began a job at Rutherford High School, teaching higher level biology for the International Baccalaureate Program, where he later served as department chair. He taught within the IB program for 16 years before coming to the Franklin County School, where he has been a valued faculty member for nearly 4 years.

I extend my best wishes to Keilan for his dedication to teaching students. I look forward to hearing of his continued success in his future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO JOY PRESCOTT

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Joy Prescott, the Glades County Teacher of the Year from Pemayetv Emahakv Charter School in Okeechobee, FL.

Joy employs a simple teaching philosophy that creates a fun learning environment that is welcoming and, most importantly, safe. In her classroom, her students know it is okay to make mistakes.

Joy indeed has a record of excellence as demonstrated in 2005 when her students made the most writing gains in Florida and in 2006 when she was named New Endeavor High School's Teacher of the Year.

Joy is a lifelong resident of Okeechobee County and spent the first 13 years of her teaching career giving back to the students in her hometown. She has been with Pemayetv Emahakv Charter School for the past 4 years, where she and her colleagues work to help preserve the Seminole Tribe of Florida's cultures and traditions. She currently teaches fourth-grade math.

I offer my best wishes to Joy and I look forward to learning of her continued success in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO ES SWIHART

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to honor Es Swihart, the Sarasota County Teacher of the Year from Riverview High School in Sarasota, FL.

After Es was presented with the Teacher of the Year award, she was asked what inspires her. She stated it was her fellow teachers that offer inspiration, through the long hours and their desire to teach lessons in new ways, plus the creative veracity with which educators make space for students as they learn to navigate the world and allow students to value their own voice serves as inspiration.

Es notes the desire for students to come to class each day while shouldering the weight of what they carry, sometimes gracefully and sometimes with awkward honesty, inspires her the most. Their optimistic view of the world and wanting others to see them for who they truly are serve as her motivation as their teacher.

As an English teacher, Es teaches her students to analyze everything, whether it be books or movies that are recent or decades old. She knows her students are understanding and experiencing educational growth when they realize books from the 1500s through 1600s can still be relevant today. Her colleagues note she opens up pathways to language with her content and is focused on the learning process for all of her students.

I am thankful to learn of Es's commitment to teaching. I extend my best wishes to her on receiving this important award and look forward to hearing of her continued success in her future endeavors.●

90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EMBASSY THEATRE

• Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to rise today to formally recognize the 90th anniversary of the Embassy Theatre in Fort Wayne, IN. Since its founding on May 14 1928, the Embassy has remained Indiana's leading self-sustaining historic theatre, welcoming more than 130,000 patrons each year. Originally built as a movie palace and vaudeville house, the theatre featured regal entertainment with a complete Page theatre pipe organ. At the height of its popularity, the Embassy frequently hosted decorated artists, including musician Tony Bennett and comedian Victor Borge. It wasn't until the evolution of television that the theater's popularity began to fade.

In 1972, the Embassy was threatened to be demolished, but several Hoosiers in the Fort Wayne community formed the Embassy Theatre Foundation to preserve its historical significance. Now in its 90th year, the Embassy Theatre continues to feature national

Broadway productions and hold various concerts of all genres.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Embassy Theatre for its famed entertainment and commitment to preserving one of Indiana's most historical sites. ●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

SOCIAL SECURITY TOTALIZATION AGREEMENT WITH ICELAND, TITLED "AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ICELAND" AND THE ACCOMPANYING LEGALLY BINDING ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT TITLED "ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT BETWEEN THE COMPETENT AUTHORITIES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ICELAND FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ICELAND"—PM 38

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith a social security totalization agreement with Iceland, titled "Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland" and the accompanying legally binding administrative arrangement, titled "Administrative Arrangement between the Competent Authorities of the United States of America and Iceland for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland" (collectively the "Agreements"). The Agreements were signed at Reykjavik, Iceland, on September 27, 2016.

The Agreements are similar in objective and content to the social security

totalization agreements already in force with other leading economic partners in Europe and elsewhere, including Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Agreements contain all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and, pursuant to section 233(c)(4), other provisions which I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the estimated number of individuals who will be affected by the Agreements and the Agreements' estimated cost effect. Also included are a summary of the main provisions of the Agreements and an annotated version of the Agreements with descriptions of each article. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration concluded that these Agreements are in the national interest of the United States.

I commend to the Congress the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland and the Administrative Arrangement between the Competent Authorities of the United States of America and Iceland for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 2018.

SOCIAL SECURITY TOTALIZATION AGREEMENT WITH SLOVENIA, TITLED "AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA" AND THE ACCOMPANYING LEGALLY BINDING ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT TITLED "ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA"—PM 39

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the

Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith a social security totalization agreement with Slovenia, titled "Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia" and the accompanying legally binding administrative arrangement, titled "Administrative Arrangement between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia" (collectively the "Agreements"). The Agreements were signed in Ljubljana, Slovenia, on January 17, 2017.

The Agreements are similar in objective and content to the social security totalization agreements already in force with other leading economic partners in Europe and elsewhere, including Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Agreements contain all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and, pursuant to section 233(c)(4), other provisions which I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the estimated number of individuals who will be affected by the Agreements and the Agreements' estimated cost effect. Also included are a summary of the main provisions of the Agreements and an annotated version of the Agreements with descriptions of each article. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration concluded that these Agreements are in the national interest of the United States.

I commend to the Congress the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia and the Administrative Arrangement between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 2018.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 35. An act to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for

inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, and for other purposes.

At 12:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2372. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5698. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish criminal offenses targeting law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 2372.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5698. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish criminal offenses targeting law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2872. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to reform the procedures provided under such Act for the initiation, investigation, and resolution of claims alleging that employing offices of the legislative branch have violated the rights and protections provided to their employees under such Act, including protections against sexual harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Aimee Kathryn Jorjani, of Wisconsin, to be Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for a term expiring January 19, 2021.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 2872. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to reform the procedures provided under such Act for the initiation, investigation, and resolution of claims alleging that employing offices of the legislative branch have violated the rights and protections provided to their employees under such Act, including protections against sexual harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2873. A bill to support businesses in Puerto Rico, extend child tax credits for families in Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 2874. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 with respect to land stewardship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2875. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain services furnished by opioid treatment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 2876. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Pike National Historic Trail; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2877. A bill to amend the Wilderness Act to allow local Federal officials to determine the manner in which nonmotorized uses may be permitted in wilderness areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. COONS):

S. 2878. A bill to improve the tracking of data on, and benefits paid to, public safety officers who are killed or disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 2879. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to promote behavioral health crisis response training among law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 2880. A bill to establish a pilot program for long-term rental assistance for families affected by major disasters in 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 2881. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to seek to enter into an agreement with the city of Vallejo, California, for the transfer of Mare Island Naval Cemetery in Vallejo, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 2882. A bill to require a report on the United States strategy in Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 2883. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan to improve research and development on therapies for traumatic

brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder, to document information on blast exposures in service records of military personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2884. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to develop a standard letter format to be provided to individuals who are indebted to the United States by virtue of their participation in benefits programs administered by the Secretary, to provide notice of debt by electronic means to such individuals when so elected, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 2885. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require additional disclosure for pharmaceutical companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COTTON:

S. Res. 515. A resolution honoring the 70th anniversary of the reactivation in 1948 of the 3d Infantry Regiment of the United States Army; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. Res. 516. A resolution designating the week of May 1 through May 7, 2018, as "National Physical Education and Sport Week"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 428

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income

of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 783

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to distribute maternity care health professionals to health professional shortage areas identified as in need of maternity care health services.

S. 808

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 808, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 966

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 966, a bill to establish a program to accurately document vehicles that were significant in the history of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 980

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payments for certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 1072

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1072, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1084

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1084, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require that the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ensure that each chief executive officer of a Federal penal or correctional institution provides a secure storage area located outside of the secure perimeter of the Federal penal or correctional institution for firearms carried by certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

S. 1086

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1086, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

S. 1278

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico

(Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1278, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union.

S. 1328

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1328, a bill to extend the protections of the Fair Housing Act to persons suffering discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and for other purposes.

S. 1333

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1333, a bill to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans.

S. 1524

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1524, a bill to improve the treatment of Federal prisoners who are primary caretaker parents, and for other purposes.

S. 1688

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1688, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate fair prescription drug prices under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 1879

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1879, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2074

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2074, a bill to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, *supra*.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

PORTMAN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2101, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the crew of the USS Indianapolis, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States.

S. 2208

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2208, a bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer's Disease Research Semipostal Stamp.

S. 2272

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2272, a bill to amend the Revised Statutes to grant State attorneys general the ability to issue subpoenas to investigate suspected violations of State laws that are applicable to national banks.

S. 2317

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2317, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for additional flexibility with respect to medication-assisted treatment for opioid use disorders, and for other purposes.

S. 2361

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2361, a bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to allow a captive insurance company that was a member of a Federal Home Loan Bank before January 19, 2016, to continue or restore the membership of the captive insurance company in the Federal Home Loan Bank, and for other purposes.

S. 2416

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2416, a bill to amend titles 5, 10, and 37, United States Code, to ensure that an order to serve on active duty under section 12304b of title 10, United States Code, is treated the same as other orders to serve on active duty for determining the eligibility of members of the uniformed services for certain benefits.

S. 2492

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2492, a bill to provide

for the reporting to State and local law enforcement authorities of cases in which the national instant criminal background check system indicates that a firearm has been sought to be acquired by a prohibited person, so that authorities may pursue criminal charges under State law, and to ensure that the Department of Justice reports to Congress on prosecutions secured against prohibited persons who attempt to acquire a firearm.

S. 2497

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2497, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2509

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2509, a bill to establish the National Park Restoration Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 2597

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2597, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program of payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2633

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2633, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to civil forfeitures relating to certain seized animals, and for other purposes.

S. 2652

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2652, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Stephen Michael Gleason.

S. 2667

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2667, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to provide for State and Tribal regulation of hemp production, and for other purposes.

S. 2801

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2801, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to clarify the effective date of the promotion of com-

missioned officers of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard, to improve processes for Federal recognition of the promotions of such officers, and for other purposes.

S. 2823

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2823, a bill to modernize copyright law, and for other purposes.

S. 2841

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2841, a bill to require policies and programs to research, prevent, and address the harmful consequences of gambling disorder among members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 154

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 154, a resolution promoting awareness of motorcycle profiling and encouraging collaboration and communication with the motorcycle community and law enforcement officials to prevent instances of profiling.

S. RES. 346

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 346, a resolution recognizing the importance and effectiveness of trauma-informed care.

S. RES. 460

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 460, a resolution condemning Boko Haram and calling on the Governments of the United States of America and Nigeria to swiftly implement measures to defeat the terrorist organization.

S. RES. 502

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 502, a resolution supporting robust relations with the State of Israel bilaterally and in multilateral fora upon seventy years of statehood, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 506

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 506, a resolution supporting the designation of May 15, 2018, as "National Senior Fraud Awareness Day" to raise awareness about the increasing number of fraudulent schemes targeted at older people of the United States, to encourage the implementation of policies to prevent these scams from happening, and to improve protections from these scams for seniors.

S. RES. 508

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S.

Res. 508, a resolution supporting the goals of Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome International Awareness Day.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 515—HONORING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REACTIVATION IN 1948 OF THE 3D INFANTRY REGIMENT OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. COTTON submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 515

Whereas, the 3d Infantry Regiment of the United States Army (commonly known as the "Old Guard") (referred to in this preamble as the "3d Infantry Regiment")—

(1) is the oldest active-duty infantry unit of the United States Army; and

(2) has served the United States since 1784; Whereas the 3d Infantry Regiment—

(1) is the escort to the President and official ceremonial unit of the United States Army; and

(2) provides security for Washington, District of Columbia, in times of national emergency and civil disturbance;

Whereas, in 1847, following the valorous performance of the 3d Infantry Regiment in the Mexican War, General Winfield Scott gave the unit the moniker of the "Old Guard" during a victory parade in Mexico City;

Whereas the 3d Infantry Regiment has a long history of service, which spans from the Battle of Fallen Timbers to World War II and the Global War on Terrorism;

Whereas, in its capacity as the official ceremonial unit of the United States Army, the 3d Infantry Regiment is responsible for conducting military ceremonies at the White House, the Pentagon, and national memorials, as well as elsewhere in the capital of the United States;

Whereas a battalion of the 3d Infantry Regiment is stationed at Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Tacoma, Washington, and has been deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan multiple times during the Global War on Terrorism; and

Whereas soldiers of 3d Infantry Regiment—

(1) maintain a 24-hour vigil at the Tomb of the Unknowns;

(2) provide military funeral escorts at Arlington National Cemetery;

(3) participate in parades at Fort Myer and Fort Lesley J. McNair; and

(4) train and are deployed for missions of the United States Army around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the 70th anniversary of the reactivation in 1948 of the 3d Infantry Regiment of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 516—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 1 THROUGH MAY 7, 2018, AS "NATIONAL PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT WEEK"

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. THUNE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 516

Whereas according to the President's Council on Sports, Fitness & Nutrition, overweight adolescents have a 70 percent chance

of becoming overweight adults, and are at an increased risk for chronic disease, disability, and death;

Whereas the Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans of the Department of Health and Human Services recommend that children and adolescents engage in at least 60 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity each day;

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—

(1) only 27 percent of high school students engage in 60 minutes a day of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity; and

(2) 14 percent of high school students do not engage in 60 or more minutes of any kind of physical activity;

Whereas the people of the United States can work together to provide a supportive and active learning environment to prepare children and adolescents to lead healthy and physically active lives; and

Whereas Congress strongly supports efforts to increase physical activity among youth and increase participation of youth in sports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 1 through May 7, 2018, as “National Physical Education and Sport Week”;;

(2) recognizes the central role of physical education and sports in creating a healthy lifestyle for children and adolescents; and

(3) encourages school districts—

(A) to implement physical education programs and classes;

(B) to provide professional development to educators relating to physical health and wellness;

(C) to work with community partners to provide opportunities to children and adolescents for physical activities before and after school, and during the summer months; and

(D) to promote district-wide mental and physical health and wellness.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2246. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes.

SA 2247. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2246 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2372, *supra*.

SA 2248. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2372, *supra*.

SA 2249. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2248 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2372, *supra*.

SA 2250. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2249 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2248 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2372, *supra*.

SA 2251. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2842, to prohibit the marketing of bogus opioid treatment programs or products; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SA 2252. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. MURKOWSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 346, to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2246. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

SA 2247. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2246 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”

SA 2248. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 2249. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2248 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”

SA 2250. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2249 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2248 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “4” and insert “5”

SA 2251. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2842, to prohibit the marketing of bogus opioid treatment programs or products; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; as follows:

In section 2(3), in the heading, strike “TREATMENT” and insert “USE”.

SA 2252. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. MURKOWSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 346, to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System; as follows:

On page 8, strike lines 18 through 21 and insert the following:

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$55,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Sen-

ate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 17, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 17, 2018, at 10:15 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 16, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on pending legislation and the following nominations: Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, Alan D. Albright, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, Thomas S. Kleeh, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of West Virginia, Peter J. Phipps, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Michael J. Truncale, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, Wendy Vitter, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and Erica H. MacDonald, to be United States Attorney for the District of Minnesota, Department of Justice.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 17, 2018, at 2:00 p.m. to conduct a closed hearing.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON SOLVENCY AND MULTI-EMPLOYER PENSION PLANS

The Joint Select Committee on Solvency and Multi-employer Pension Plans is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 17, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The Structure and Financial Outlook of the Pension Outlook of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.”

NATIONAL VOLCANO EARLY WARNING AND MONITORING SYSTEM ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 150, S. 346.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 346) to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. 346

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

[Congress finds that—

[(1) the United States and the territories of the United States contain 169 hazardous volcanoes;

[(2) since 1980, eruptions have claimed many lives and cost billions of dollars in property damage in the United States;

[(3) ash eruptions pose a hazard to high-flying jet aircraft, including the more than 50,000 passengers who travel on jets over Alaska and the North Pacific every day;

[(4) in 1989, an eruption of Redoubt Volcano, Alaska, caused in-flight failure of all 4 engines of a passenger Boeing 747 aircraft;

[(5) international flights over the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the intense domestic air traffic of the Pacific Northwest also face potential engine failure in the event of an eruption;

[(6) mudflows from ice-clad Cascade volcanoes of the States of Washington, Oregon, and California pose a serious hazard to cities and transportation arteries in the Pacific Northwest;

[(7) lava flows, toxic gas emissions, and explosions impact residents and visitors to the State of Hawaii and have the potential to cause catastrophic property damage;

[(8) frequent seismic unrest requires careful monitoring in the Mammoth Lakes area of the State of California and Yellowstone National Park in the States of Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho;

[(9) modern technology, in the form of geophysical monitoring networks on the ground and the use of near real-time satellite data, makes possible early warnings typically weeks or months before eruptions, giving emergency response agencies and the public time to prepare, which minimizes potential damage to property and loss of life;

[(10) the efficacy of monitoring is being demonstrated by—

[(A) the successful forecasts and warnings of Augustine Volcano in 1986 and 2006, Redoubt Volcano in 1989 through 1990 and 2009, and Mt. Spurr in 1992; and

[(B) warnings and forecasts of lava flow advancement in Hawaii during the ongoing eruption of Kilauea;

[(11) the United States Geological Survey and university and State partners of the United States Geological Survey operate—

[(A) the Alaska Volcano Observatory located in Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska;

[(B) the Cascades Volcano Observatory located in Vancouver, Washington;

[(C) the Hawaiian Volcano Observatory located in Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park, Hawaii;

[(D) the Yellowstone Volcano Observatory located in Yellowstone National Park in the States of Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho; and

[(E) the California Volcano Observatory, located in Menlo Park, California; and

[(12) a detailed survey of the volcanoes in the United States and the monitoring status of those volcanoes has revealed numerous serious monitoring gaps, leaving the United States exposed to preventable damage from large volcanic eruptions.]

SEC. [3]2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

(2) SYSTEM.—The term “System” means the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System established under section 4 3(a)(1).

SEC. [4]3. NATIONAL VOLCANO EARLY WARNING AND MONITORING SYSTEM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish within the United States Geological Survey a system, to be known as the “National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System”, to monitor, warn, and protect citizens of the United States from undue and avoidable harm from volcanic activity.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the System are—

(A) to organize, modernize, standardize, and stabilize the monitoring systems of the volcano observatories in the United States, which includes the Alaska Volcano Observatory, California Volcano Observatory, Cascades Volcano Observatory, Hawaiian Volcano Observatory, and Yellowstone Volcano Observatory; and

(B) to unify the monitoring systems of volcano observatories in the United States into a single interoperative system.

(3) OBJECTIVE.—The objective of the System is to monitor all the volcanoes in the United States at a level commensurate with the threat posed by the volcanoes by—

(A) upgrading existing networks on monitored volcanoes;

(B) installing new networks on unmonitored volcanoes; and

(C) employing geodetic and other components when applicable.

(b) SYSTEM COMPONENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The System shall include—

(A) a national volcano watch office that is operational 24 hours a day and 7 days a week;

(B) a national volcano data center; and

(C) an external grants program to support research in volcano monitoring science and technology.

(2) MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES.—Modernization activities under the System shall include the comprehensive application of emerging technologies, including digital broadband seismometers, real-time continuous Global Positioning System receivers, satellite and airborne radar interferometry, acoustic pressure sensors, and spectrometry to measure gas emissions.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a 5-year management plan for establishing and operating the System.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The management plan submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) annual cost estimates for modernization activities and operation of the System;

(ii) annual milestones, standards, and performance goals; and

(iii) recommendations for, and progress towards, establishing new, or enhancing existing, partnerships to leverage resources.

(2) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee to assist the Secretary in implementing the System, to be comprised of representatives of relevant agencies and members of the scientific community, to be appointed by the Secretary.

(3) PARTNERSHIPS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with institutions of higher education and State agencies designating the institutions of

higher education and State agencies as volcano observatory partners for the System.

(4) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the activities under this Act with the heads of relevant Federal agencies, including—

(A) the Secretary of Transportation;

(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration;

(C) the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and

(D) the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Administration.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—Annually, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes the activities carried out under this Act.

SEC. [5]4. FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2027.

(b) EFFECT ON OTHER SOURCES OF FEDERAL FUNDING.—Amounts made available under this section shall supplement, and not supplant, Federal funds made available for other United States Geological Survey hazards activities and programs.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to, the Murkowski amendment at the desk be agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendments were agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2252) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the authorization of appropriations)

On page 8, strike lines 18 through 21 and insert the following:

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$55,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 346), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 346

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

(2) SYSTEM.—The term “System” means the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System established under section 3(a)(1).

SEC. 3. NATIONAL VOLCANO EARLY WARNING AND MONITORING SYSTEM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish within the United States Geological Survey a system, to be known as the “National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System”, to monitor, warn, and protect citizens

of the United States from undue and avoidable harm from volcanic activity.

(2) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the System are—

(A) to organize, modernize, standardize, and stabilize the monitoring systems of the volcano observatories in the United States, which includes the Alaska Volcano Observatory, California Volcano Observatory, Cascades Volcano Observatory, Hawaiian Volcano Observatory, and Yellowstone Volcano Observatory; and

(B) to unify the monitoring systems of volcano observatories in the United States into a single interoperative system.

(3) **OBJECTIVE.**—The objective of the System is to monitor all the volcanoes in the United States at a level commensurate with the threat posed by the volcanoes by—

(A) upgrading existing networks on monitored volcanoes;

(B) installing new networks on unmonitored volcanoes; and

(C) employing geodetic and other components when applicable.

(b) **SYSTEM COMPONENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The System shall include—

(A) a national volcano watch office that is operational 24 hours a day and 7 days a week;

(B) a national volcano data center; and

(C) an external grants program to support research in volcano monitoring science and technology.

(2) **MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES.**—Modernization activities under the System shall include the comprehensive application of emerging technologies, including digital broadband seismometers, real-time continuous Global Positioning System receivers, satellite and airborne radar interferometry, acoustic pressure sensors, and spectrometry to measure gas emissions.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a 5-year management plan for establishing and operating the System.

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The management plan submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) annual cost estimates for modernization activities and operation of the System;

(ii) annual milestones, standards, and performance goals; and

(iii) recommendations for, and progress towards, establishing new, or enhancing existing, partnerships to leverage resources.

(2) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee to assist the Secretary in implementing the System, to be comprised of representatives of relevant agencies and members of the scientific community, to be appointed by the Secretary.

(3) **PARTNERSHIPS.**—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with institutions of higher education and State agencies designating the institutions of higher education and State agencies as volcano observatory partners for the System.

(4) **COORDINATION.**—The Secretary shall coordinate the activities under this Act with the heads of relevant Federal agencies, including—

(A) the Secretary of Transportation;

(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration;

(C) the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and

(D) the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Administration.

(d) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Annually, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes the activities carried out under this Act.

SEC. 4. FUNDING.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$55,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

(b) **EFFECT ON OTHER SOURCES OF FEDERAL FUNDING.**—Amounts made available under this section shall supplement, and not supplant, Federal funds made available for other United States Geological Survey hazards activities and programs.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR THE REAPPOINTMENT OF BARBARA M. BARRETT AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S.J. Res. 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 60) providing for the reappointment of Barbara M. Barrett as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 60) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 60

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Barbara M. Barrett of Arizona on January 10, 2019, is filled by the reappointment of the incumbent. The reappointment is for a term of 6 years, beginning on the later of January 11, 2019, or the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

HONORING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REACTIVATION IN 1948 OF THE 3D INFANTRY REGIMENT OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 515, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 515) honoring the 70th anniversary of the reactivation in 1948 of the 3d Infantry Regiment of the United States Army.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 515) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 516, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 516) designating the week of May 1 through May 7, 2018, as "National Physical Education and Sport Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 516) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 21, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, May 21; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. I further ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Baiocco nomination; further, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session of the Senate ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday; finally, that the filing deadline for first-degree

amendments to the House message to accompany S. 2372 be at 5 p.m., Monday.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
MAY 21, 2018, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:10 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 21, 2018, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. NARCISO CRUZ
COL. MARK K. MIERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH F. JARRARD
BRIG. GEN. TRACY R. NORRIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. LAUREL J. HUMMEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. TOMMY H. BAKER
BRIG. GEN. GREGORY S. BOWEN
BRIG. GEN. SCOTT A. CAMPBELL
BRIG. GEN. JAMES D. CRAIG
BRIG. GEN. GORDON L. ELLIS
BRIG. GEN. JOHN M. EPPERLY
BRIG. GEN. TIMOTHY E. GOWEN
BRIG. GEN. PAUL F. GRIFFIN
BRIG. GEN. KENNETH S. HARA
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER F. LAWSON
BRIG. GEN. JAMES E. PORTER, JR.
BRIG. GEN. RAFAEL A. RIBAS
BRIG. GEN. TIMOTHY J. SHERIFF
BRIG. GEN. THOMAS F. SPENCER
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL D. TURELLO
BRIG. GEN. SUZANNE P. VARES-LUM
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM J. WALKER
BRIG. GEN. RONALD A. WESTFALL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. MIGUEL AGUILAR
COL. EUGENE S. ALKIRE
COL. MARK J. BERGLUND
COL. RONALD W. BURKETT II
COL. ROBERT F. CHARLESWORTH
COL. NICK DUCICH
COL. ROBERT D. FERGOUSON
COL. ADAM R. FLASCH
COL. KEVIN W. GALLAGHER
COL. JOHN T. GENTRY, JR.
COL. BRYAN J. GRENON
COL. JOHN D. HAAS
COL. EDWARD H. HALLENBECK
COL. JOE D. HARGETT
COL. ROBERT F. HEPNER, JR.
COL. CHARLES G. KEMPER IV
COL. STEVEN T. KING
COL. MICHAEL J. LEENEY
COL. ROY J. MACARAEO
COL. JOANNE E. MACGREGOR
COL. MARIE M. MAHONEY
COL. SHAWN P. MANKIE
COL. JAMES G. MCCORMACK
COL. MIGUEL A. MENDEZ
COL. NEAL S. MITSUYOSHI

COL. SHARON D. MOORE
COL. MICHAEL J. OSTER
COL. GREGORY C. PARKER
COL. SCOTT T. PETRIK
COL. JERRY F. PROCHASKA
COL. JAVIER A. REINA
COL. YESENIA R. ROQUE
COL. LEO A. RYAN
COL. MICHAEL J. SCHLORHOLTZ
COL. SCOTT M. SHERMAN
COL. TYLER B. SMITH
COL. WALTER B. STUREK, JR.
COL. JOHN F. TAYLOR, JR.
COL. THOMAS E. VERN, JR.
COL. DAMIAN K. WADDELL
COL. ROBERT F. WEIR
COL. KATHERINE E. WHITE
COL. JAMES C. WILKINS
COL. TIMOTHY J. WINSLOW

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 156:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CHRISTOPHER C. FRENCH

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CARL E. MUNDY III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LORETTA E. REYNOLDS

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(D):

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MATTHEW T. BELL, JR.
REAR ADM. (LH) MELISSA BERT
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID M. DERMANELIAN
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT P. HAYES
REAR ADM. (LH) ANDREW J. TIONGSON
REAR ADM. (LH) ANTHONY J. VOGT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203(A):

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ANDREW S. MCKINLEY

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

KOURTNI L. STARKEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

HERMANN F. HINZE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

DIANE M. ARMBRUSTER
LELAND D. BLANCHARD II
BRADLEY K. BURNS
JOSEPH A. DINONNO
CARLOS L. HOPKINS
RICHARD M. MARCINKO
DONALD S. MITCHELL
LELAND T. SHEPHERD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DONALD C. BREWER III
STEVE A. POSTER
CREGG M. PUCKETT
ALEJANDRO J. SANCHEZMUNOZ
CHARLES F. WALLACE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JAMES D. SPENCER II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER A. BASSETT
LAWRENCE T. BLEBOO
TIMOTHY A. BOHR
SCOTT E. BOYD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

JULIE A. CRAIG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

CHARLES G. BLAKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

THOMAS A. URQUHART

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ROBERT L. ANDERSON II
KATHLEEN K. COOPERMAN
DARRYL E. GREEN
RONA D. GREEN
JAMES R. HAGEN
BRIAN C. HATCH
MARC D. HERWITZ
MATTHEW J. HOLCOMB
WILLIAM R. HOWARD
FRANCA R. JONES
LESLIE A. KINDLING
WILLIAM J. PLUMMER III
DONNA POULIN
JAMES C. QUICK III
MARGARET M. READ
JEFFREY J. REPASS
ARLENE R. SAITZYK
RONALD L. SCHOONOVER
THAD J. SHARP
DANIELLE M. WOOTEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

HAROLD C. BARNES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

PAUL R. ALLEN
JESSICA S. BAIN
LAURIE E. BASABE
WILLIAM S. BYERS
LANA R. CLOUSER
DARREN J. COUTURE
JULIE A. DARLING
RONALD A. FANCHER
PATRICK J. FITZPATRICK
TRACEY R. GILES
STEPHEN L. GUIDRY
RHONDA O. HINDS
SHARON L. HOUSE
TRACY R. ISAAC
SHAWN B. KASE
RICHARD B. LAWRENCE
JEANNE M. LEWANDOWSKI
LAURA L. MCMULLEN
THOMAS OLIVERO
KIM P. SHAUGHNESSY
DARRYL B. SOL
ANDREW D. TARRANT
CRAIG T. VASS
MICHELE A. WAARA
WILLIAM W. WIEGMANN
FRANCISCO I. WONPAT
STEVEN T. YADEN
KIM T. ZABLAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JASON W. ADAMS
ARCANGELO P. DELLANNO
PAUL W. DEMEYER
JOHN H. HAMILTON IV
ALBERT L. HORNYAK
WESLEY P. JOHNSON
ANDREW J. LEWIS
RYAN D. LOOKABILL
ERIK R. NALEY
ERIK S. OBELLOS
CORY D. SCHEMM
JOHNETTA C. THOMAS
SHAWN M. TRIGGS

JASON C. WARNER
LAGENA K. G. YARBROUGH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

PAUL C. CHAN
GARY W. DOSS
LANCE M. FLOOD
ANA I. FRANCO
LUKE B. GREENE
JOSEPH D. HARDER III
RANDALL E. HARMeyer
CHAD O. LORENZANA
THOMAS B. MCLEMORE
EDWARD B. MILLER IV
NATHANIEL R. STRAUB

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

PHILIP B. BAGROW
DAVID L. CLINE
MICHAEL E. FOSKETT
WAYNE M. HADDAD
ROY E. HOFFMAN
HENRY F. HOLCOMBE, JR.
PHILIP D. KING
HAGAN R. MCCLELLAN, JR.
RYAN R. RUPE
RICHARD H. RYAN, JR.
BETH A. STALLINGA
CLIFFORD A. STUART
DAVID B. THAMES
DAVID M. TODD
PAUL S. TREMBLAY
CHARLES E. VARSOGEA
BRIAN D. WEIGELT
TEDDY L. WILLIAMS, JR.
DAVID S. YANG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

HUGH BURKE
TANYA CRUZ
KATHLEEN A. ELKINS
ARTHUR L. GASTON III
JOAN M. MALIK
WAYNE A. MIANI, JR.
MEGAN K. SMITH
EDWARD K. WESTBROOK II
CHRISTOPHER M. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ZACHARY M. ALEXANDER
JAY E. ALLARD
ALEX L. AUBIN
FRANK O. AXELSEN
DAVID A. BARROWS
RANDY S. BELL
JOHN C. BIERY
ANTHONY C. BOGANEY
CHAD BRADFORD
JORGE L. BRITO
LEO A. CARNEY
ROBERT J. CARPENTER III
JOHN B. CASON
SUSAN C. CLARK
JANINE R. DANKO
GRAY N. DAWSON
JOHN J. DEVLIN
ANDREW P. DOAN
HARLAN F. DOREY
JILL E. EMERICK
THOMAS Q. GALLAGHER
TODD A. GARDNER
TODD D. GLEESON
ELIZABETH A. GRASMUCK
JOY A. GREER
CATHERINE E. HAGAN
DANIEL B. HAWLEY
EWELL M. HOLLIS
CHADLEY R. HUEBNER
DANIEL R. JUBA
ANTHONY W. KELLER
CORY J. KUCIK
FERNANDO F. LEYVA
ANDREW H. LIN
ROBERT A. LIOTTA
MICHELLE F. LIU
NAM T. LY
WILLIAM MANN
DEBRA A. MANNING
JOEL T. MCFARLAND
PETER C. MCGOWAN
EDMUND A. MILDNER
JOE MILLER
JOHN R. MINARCIC
EMORI A. MOORE
CHRISTOPHER J. NEAL
KRISTIE A. ROBSON
CORBY D. ROPP
KRISTIAN E. SANCHACK
BETTINA M. SAUTER
JOEL M. SCHOFER
ANDREA N. SNITCHLER

LEAH K. SOLEY
DAVID M. STEVENS
SEAN P. STROUP
DANIELLE A. TAYSOM
JOHN P. TRAFELI
TRICIA E. VANWAGNER
ROBERT N. WALTER
RUSTIN C. WALTERS
NATALIE Y. WELLS
TIMOTHY M. WILKS
MARK L. WOODBRIDGE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

RENE J. ALOVA
PETER R. BARNDT
RAUL L. BARRIENTOS
THOMAS E. BERCHTOLD
JOHN E. BISSELL
PRESTON C. BRIGGS
TROY W. BROOKS
VINH D. DOAN
MARTIN E. EVERS
KELLY M. GOODIN
CHRISTOPHER M. HAMLIN
JOHN B. HOYOS
BRADLEY E. JONES
CHRISTOPHER J. KANE
NIMA A. KHORASSANI
THU N. LUU
MATTHEW B. B. MILLER
MICHAEL T. MOONEY
JOHVIN PERRY
MICHAEL E. RUDMANN
RODNEY V. SCOTT
ZHENGSHI SONG
JAMES M. THOMPSON, JR.
JOYCE Y. TURNER
HOWARD K. VANNESS
SABINA S. YUN
STEPHEN S. YUNE

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by
the Senate May 17, 2018:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
GINA HASPEL, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF
JEB PARR, UNITED STATES NAVY

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to commemorate the life of my former constituent, Jeb Parr, who passed away on April 19. Jeb was a fervent advocate for our nation's public shipyards. His sudden passing is a huge loss to the submarine and ship maintenance community.

Jeb dedicated his professional life to the U.S. Navy. He began his active service career in 1975. At that time, he enrolled in and completed the yearlong nuclear engineering training at the fast-paced and prestigious Naval Nuclear Power School, which was founded by the father of the America's Nuclear Navy, Admiral Hyman G. Rickover. It was here where the motto "Knowledge, Integrity, Excellence" was forever ingrained in Jeb. He would carry this standard with him for the rest of his life.

Following eight years of active military service, Jeb came to Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility (PSNS&IMF) to work as a nuclear engineer. Over his thirty years of dedicated service at the shipyard, Jeb nurtured a passion for teaching others and served an integral role in developing nuclear training and qualification programs at the shipyard. He possessed an innate ability to recognize and acknowledge the person behind the trainee or worker. He was often sent by managers to facilitate discussions between parties with opposing views, as he had a talent for finding common ground and identifying a solution to challenging problems. These abilities, coupled with his prior experience, brought him to work in the Industrial Operations Directorate at Naval Sea Systems Command in Washington, D.C. in 2016 to oversee training and personnel policy at all four public shipyards.

Jeb leaves behind his loving husband of two-and-a-half years, José Isidoro Lemus. He will be remembered for his willingness to take time for others, his kindness, and his commitment to mission. On behalf of myself and the U.S. House of Representatives, we send our thoughts and prayers to José and the rest of Jeb's family during this challenging time.

KYANA AIDUKAITIS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kyana Aidukaitis for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Kyana Aidukaitis received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kyana Aidukaitis is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kyana Aidukaitis for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING LOUIS C. THARP

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my constituent, Louis C. Tharp of Upper Nyack, New York. Mr. Tharp recently finished a six-year term on the Army Education Advisory Committee, a committee governed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

During his tenure on the Army Education Advisory Committee, Mr. Tharp worked on a number of important issues including women in combat, sexual assault and harassment, a facilitated soldier teaching plan, soldier talent management, Soldier 2020, an assessment of drill sergeant responsibilities, and second- and third-order effects of transgender integration.

He was recommended for this Senior Executive Service position by former Pennsylvania Congressman Patrick Murphy and the Victory Institute's Presidential Appointments Initiative. During his tenure at West Point, Mr. Tharp served as the first out gay coach and authored "Overachiever's Diary, How the Army Triathlon Team Became National Contenders." The proceeds from its sale benefited the team.

Mr. Tharp served honorably in the Indiana National Guard. In addition, he has contributed to several organizations, including Knights Out, the West Point LGBT alumni association, and the Rockland County Anti-Bias Commission, which he chaired. He currently serves as Executive Director and Co-Founder of the Global Healthy Living Foundation, a nonprofit organization dedicated to improving the lives of people with chronic illness. Mr. Tharp and his husband, Jim Bumgardner, will celebrate 34 years together this fall.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow Members of Congress to join me in expressing thanks to Mr. Tharp for his service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, I missed three votes. Had I been present, I

would have voted: Roll Call No. 181—Yes; Roll Call No. 182—Yes; and Roll Call No. 183—Yes.

SAYDA JASMIN MERAZ APODACA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sayda Jasmin Meraz Apodaca for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Sayda Jasmin Meraz Apodaca received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sayda Jasmin Meraz Apodaca is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives. I extend my deepest congratulations to Sayda Jasmin Meraz Apodaca for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

CONGRATULATING MAYOR RICHARD WARD OF HURST, TEXAS ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding public servant from my district, Mayor Richard Ward of Hurst, Texas, who is retiring after 22 years of service to his community.

Richard Ward has served as Mayor of the City of Hurst for the last 14 years, but his commitment to his nation and community began well before then. Just after graduating from Polytechnic High School in Fort Worth, he served in the Army from 1954 to 1957 as an X-ray technician stationed in Frankfurt, Germany. Upon his return to Texas, Richard began a career as a medical instruments salesman and later in Human Resource Management, after receiving a bachelor of General Studies Degree from Texas Christian University in 1982. His work has taken him to several prestigious institutes including Medical Plaza Hospital in Fort Worth, Parkland Hospital in Dallas, and Cornerstone Health Management in Dallas.

In 1962, Richard became a resident of Hurst and began volunteering in youth sports and civil groups. He served on the Board of Directors for Pee Wee Football Association, as a

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

coach for Little Dribblers Basketball, and as a Scout Master for the Boy Scouts of America.

Richard was first elected to the City Council of Hurst in 1976 and served through 1980; he then served again from 2000–2004. In 2004, Richard was elected mayor, a position that he has honorably held for the last 14 years, working tirelessly to improve the Hurst community.

Under Mayor Ward's leadership, Hurst has seen incredible growth. As a part of the Transforming Hurst Initiative, the city has completed a series of ambitious projects including the Hurst Conference Center, the Hurst Senior Center, Fire Station 2, the Hurst Justice Center, and the Hurst Chisholm and Central Aquatic Centers. The city has also expanded parks and recreation programs and championed customer service and staff development initiatives. Through this process, Mayor Ward has earned a reputation for balancing fiscal responsibility and economic development. In collaboration with Hurst Councilmembers, he has been able to establish partnerships with local developers and community leaders to revitalize and transform the community.

At the heart of these projects is a commitment to public safety and high quality of life for Hurst's nearly 40,000 residents. In recognition of his efforts and those of councilmembers, the Texas City Manager's Association (TCMA) recognized the Hurst City Council as "Council of the Year" in both 2013 and 2014.

For more than two decades, Richard Ward has demonstrated unreserved dedication to public service and community involvement. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in honoring Mayor Richard Ward for his extraordinary service and wishing him and his family the best in his retirement.

SHARING STUDENTS' 'MARCH FOR OUR LIVES' REMARKS

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, I came to the Floor and spoke about the March For Our Lives on March 24 and the nine extraordinarily poised students in Morristown, New Jersey, who spoke at the rally there, which I attended. I include in the RECORD remarks by Mia Paone. I hope my colleagues will read them and internalize the sense of fear in which our nation's students are living every day—and our responsibility as Members of Congress to do something to address this crisis of gun violence.

MARCH FOR OUR LIVES' REMARKS BY MIA PAONE

Hello marchers! My name is Mia Paone, and I am a sophomore at Chatham High School. I am not old enough to vote yet, but I am old enough to speak out against gun violence. I will not be silent.

I am taking a stand to change our gun laws, and I need all of you to join me. Silence is not neutrality. Silence will lead to more deaths from school shootings and other gun violence. I am here to speak for those silenced too soon.

For the young kids at Sandy Hook. For the concert goers in Las Vegas. For the students

from Parkland, the same age as me. I don't want to live in a world where we have to find hiding spots and ways to block the door in our classrooms. In my school, a week after the Parkland Shooting, a power outage occurred. Many of my friends and other students feared the worst; that we were next, because these tragedies have sadly become too routine. Why have no laws been passed to make us safer? Why is it easier to get a gun than it is to get a driver's license? Too many of us are silent.

It is time for us to stand up. It is time for us to speak out. If we want a change in laws, we need to change our actions. Write letters to Members of Congress. Participate in school walkouts and . . . walk in marches! Run for Congress or local office. If you are too young to run, volunteer for a candidate who is running. Register 18-year-olds to vote, and encourage registered voters to show up on Election Day.

The youngest generation of eligible voters has the lowest voter turnout. We live in a democracy. Our senators and representatives should be responsive to our opinions. If they are not, it's our job to elect candidates who are. If they do not listen, vote them out!

Our generation's voter turnout must increase if we want leaders who will take action to reduce gun violence and gun deaths. And if you are like me, not yet old enough to vote but want to impact change, have faith. Just because we're in high school doesn't mean we can't make a difference.

Two weeks ago, on the day of the walkout, my history class was learning about the Civil Rights movements of the 1960's. Many of those events were organized by high school and college students. If they could do it, why can't we? It is our job as the upcoming generation of voters, leaders, and activists to make clear that when we believe something needs to be changed, we will not be silent.

We will not stand down. We will stand up, stand together, and we will not stop speaking out until our voices are heard.

MADILYNN HAINES

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Madilynn Haines for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Madilynn Haines received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Madilynn Haines is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Madilynn Haines for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HUMBLE HIGH SCHOOL ARMY JROTC

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Army Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (JROTC) of Humble High School in Humble, Texas have gone above and beyond, and our community is proud of their outstanding achievements.

The Humble High School JROTC has a history of success and are known for their commitment to giving back to our community. Under the direction of Sergeant Major Watkins, the cadets do much more than drill competitions and marching in parades. They serve their school and community, performing various service projects and duties throughout the year.

During National Police Week in May, the cadets show honor to police officers who were killed in the line of duty, by holding 10 foot avenue flag poles at my annual Police Memorial Ceremony. The cadets are always dressed in their best as they proudly display Old Glory. Survivors, police officers, and community leaders walk through this sea of red, white, and blue as they enter the Police Memorial Ceremony. The cadets do an admirable job representing Humble High School.

Every Veterans Day, the JROTC cadets pay tribute to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier through a reenactment. The ceremony is well known in the community and is appropriately called the Wildcat Salute to Veterans. As the sun peaks over the horizon, members of the Humble community, veterans, and students arrive at the high school, but instead of hallways adorned with Wildcat posters and traditional school spirit signs, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier display sits in front of visitors. The tribute begins with the traditional laying of a wreath and the Changing of the Guard ritual. The cadets are trained as Sentinels and guard the Tomb all day. Their service and patriotism to our nation sets them apart as role models to other students. The reenactment serves as a memorial to service members who have admirably fought and died for our country yet remain unknown. The tomb declares—"Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God."

There are countless other service projects they participate in throughout the year. They do not go unnoticed. I know that the residents of Humble are proud of Humble High School JROTC accomplishments. I applaud them for their tremendous achievements and commend them for giving back to our community. They make a difference and represent all that is right and good in America.

And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to travel back to Washington due to illness. Had I been present, I would have

voted YEA on Roll Call No. 188, and YEA on Roll Call No. 189.

NIMO JAMA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Nimo Jama for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Nimo Jama received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Nimo Jama is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives. I extend my deepest congratulations to Nimo Jama for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

COMMUNITY SALUTES

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor forty-six high school seniors in Camden County for their commendable decision to enlist in the United States Armed Forces. Of these forty-six, eight have joined the Navy: Joshua Fitzgerald, Samuel Keppel, Niemai Smith, Ryan Hutchinson, Preston Solla, Nicholas Yourkonis, Noah Berrios, and Nasir Crews. Nineteen have joined the Marine Corps: Giovanni Pasquarelli, Jesse Harryman, William Jamieson, Ethan Moncrief, William Sayers, Jack Percak, Brian Romerogranadeno, Anthony Vitkunas, Trshaun Kelly, Delious Bullock, Luke Hurey, Jeserica Santos, Marvin Sewell, Remy Martinez, Andre Castro, Adrian Vargas, Cristian Reyes-Nunez, Kenneth Cortez, and Jeffery Nolasco. Two have joined the Air Force: Alexis Tapia, and Dominique Perez. Eight have joined the New Jersey Army National Guard: Kianna Smith, Savannah Janiszewski, Christopher Berrios, Chanese Gibson, Kiaziah Walker, Alesi Villeda-Gomes, Breinna Edwards, and Aleksey Kilvington. And nine have joined the New Jersey Air National Guard: Jose Sanchez, Jamilette Cotts-Martinez, Nyree Scott, Paul Brown, Alex Frazier, Angel Burgos, Emma Super, Mason Nicini, Michael Rinehart. All forty-six were recognized on May 15th at "Our Community Salutes of South Jersey."

Later this month, these young men and women will join their classmates in celebration of graduation. At a time when many of their peers are looking forward to pursuing vocational training or college degrees, they instead have chosen to dedicate themselves to military service in defense of our country. They should rest assured that the full support and

resources of this chamber, and of the American people, are with them in whatever challenges may lie ahead.

It is thanks to the dedication of untold numbers of patriots like these forty-six that we are able to meet here today, in the House of Representatives, and openly debate the best solutions to the many and diverse problems that confront our country. It is thanks to their sacrifices that the United States of America remains a beacon of hope and freedom in a fractious world.

Mr. Speaker, their decision to serve our country will not go unrecognized. I want to personally thank these forty-six graduating seniors for the selflessness and courage that they have shown by volunteering to risk their lives in defense of others. We owe them, along with all those who serve our country, a deep debt of gratitude.

CONGRATULATING JOANNA DYE ON HER RETIREMENT

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. JoAnna Dye, who is retiring from Black Hawk College. Ms. Dye has become a pillar of the Black Hawk community, and she will be greatly missed.

Ms. Dye has worked at Black Hawk College for 34 years, serving as the Financial Aid Director for the last 12 years. She has always gone above and beyond, and received the 2010 Sustained Service Award from the Illinois Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (ILASFAA) in recognition of her notable contributions to Black Hawk College. Additionally, Ms. Dye has worked to deliver professional development, leadership and educational opportunities to colleagues and students throughout Illinois by serving as the Executive Vice President and later the President of the ILASFAA. Her dedication to ensuring all our children have the opportunity to succeed has undoubtedly enriched our community and the lives of those she has touched.

It is because of dedicated and selfless leaders such as Ms. JoAnna Dye that I am especially proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Ms. JoAnna Dye on her well-earned retirement and thank her for all of her contributions and service to our community.

MATTHEW KHAMOV

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Matthew Khamov for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Matthew Khamov received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Matthew Khamov is exemplary of the type of achieve-

ment that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives. I extend my deepest congratulations to Matthew Khamov for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EVAN H. JENKINS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I joined the U.S. Surgeon General during his visit to my congressional district in Huntington, West Virginia, to speak at the Cabell Huntington Hospital Regional Health Summit. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 178; YEA on Roll Call No. 179; and YEA on Roll Call No. 180.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID W. THOMPSON

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to David W. Thompson, the President and CEO of Orbital ATK, Incorporated and the Co-founder, Chairman and CEO of Orbital Sciences Corporation, for his extraordinary and ongoing contributions to the nation. Mr. Thompson has contributed nearly four decades of leadership in the advancement of space technology and national defense. History will note that he conceived and built Orbital Sciences Corporation as a pioneering venture that was among the first to demonstrate a new model of commercial funding, development and manufacture of space systems.

Both companies have flourished in Virginia. Orbital ATK, headquartered in Dulles, Virginia, is the largest new space and defense technology company to emerge in the post-Sputnik era. Orbital grew from three employees and zero revenue in 1982 to become Orbital ATK with 14,000 employees and a \$9 billion enterprise value. Orbital ATK is one of the world's top 10 aerospace and defense manufacturers. It is among the top five suppliers to NASA and it is a critical partner with the US Department of Defense. Orbital ATK's services to the nation include resupplying the International Space Station using its Antares launch vehicle and Cygnus spacecraft and providing essential national defense capabilities that include the company's key role in protecting America from ballistic missile attack.

For over 36 years, Mr. Thompson has inspired new generations of engineers and scientists to conceive innovative space and national defense solutions through his exceptional vision, creativity, perseverance and dedication. Mr. Thompson's many awards include the National Medal of Technology, Virginia's Industrialist of the Year, High-Tech-nology Entrepreneur of the year, the National

Air and Space Museum Trophy and the Theodore von Karman International Wings Award. Mr. Thompson is a Fellow of the American Astronautical Society and the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics.

America and Virginia have been abundantly blessed by the patriotism, dedication and achievement of David Thompson. David has enjoyed the loving support of his wife Catherine and daughter Maggie. I wish them God-speed and continued success as David pioneers a new chapter.

KATHRYN KLEMPPEL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kathryn Klempel for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Kathryn Klempel received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kathryn Klempel is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives. I extend my deepest congratulations to Kathryn Klempel for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO WORLD WAR II VETERAN PAUL ROSENBLATT ON HIS 95TH BIRTHDAY

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to World War II veteran Paul Rosenblatt in honor of his 95th birthday.

"Mr. Paul," as he prefers to be called, is a Purple Heart recipient and the last remaining member of his unit, the 9th Armored Division. His unit successfully held the Ludendorff Bridge at Remagen, releasing Allied forces into Germany that ultimately led to Germany's defeat.

Paul was born in Michigan in 1923 but raised in The Bronx, New York. After the death of his father, Paul began working at the age of 15. By 1942, Paul was living and working in Dayton, Ohio for the U.S. Army engineering unit as an aircraft mechanic's assistant. As a vital member of the engineering team, his personnel officer urged him to resist joining the Army and remain in his current position. Despite the opposition, Paul answered the call to serve and enlisted in the Army, where he was sent overseas as a mechanic for the 9th Armored Division.

After serving three years, Paul was discharged from the Army and returned to his position in Dayton. Here he met his wife, the late

Millie Rosenblatt, who traveled with him throughout the country and world during his 43-year career as a civilian contractor with the Air Force. Paul, his wife, and their four children lived in Santa Maria, CA; Rapid City, SD; Laredo, TX; and abroad in Turkey, England and Israel.

By the 1950's, Paul finally had the chance to fly. He knew each part of the aircrafts he worked on, but was never given the opportunity to go up in the air. In Laredo, Paul and a group of his friends bought a plane together and named themselves "The Flying 20."

In addition to his work within the Army and Air Force, Paul is also a servant of his community. While living in Santa Maria, the Jewish community was holding services in basement of a Methodist church. Unsettled by this arrangement, Paul sought out a California Polytechnic Institute architecture student to design blueprints for a synagogue and launched a fundraising campaign. By 1969, Temple Beth El was constructed.

Paul finished his career at his dream job working at the American embassy in Tel Aviv and retired in Haifa, Israel with Millie. After 63 years of marriage, Millie passed away and two years later, Paul moved to Mobile, Alabama following a visit with his daughter, Shoshana, and her husband, Jake.

In the past three years, Paul has embraced the Mobile culture. Paul rode on the World War II float in a Mardi Gras parade, attended every showing at the Mobile Jewish Film Festival, and held season tickets to the Mobile Symphony.

For his 95th birthday, Paul celebrated accordingly by taking a trip to the air in a Stearman biplane, the same model he worked on as the mechanic's assistant before World War II. Family and friends gathered at the airway to celebrate this momentous occasion.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Alabama's First Congressional District, I want to commend Paul Rosenblatt for his service to our country and community. America is a better place because of Paul Rosenblatt, and we will be forever grateful for his service.

HONORING JOEY DANIEL

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Joey Daniel for his spectacular performance in the California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) State wrestling championship this year where he earned a CIF state title at 220 pounds.

Currently a senior at Santa Ana High School, Mr. Daniel has already proven his excellence in wrestling by winning the Golden West League championship four times, the CIF championship three times, the Masters Meet championship once, and the Orange Country championship five times during his wrestling career between 2014 to 2018. This year in March, he reached new heights and became the first winner of the CIF state wrestling championship in the history of Santa Ana High School, took second place nationally, and was promptly named Orange County's boys wrestler of the year.

After graduation from high school, Mr. Daniel plans to enlist in the Marine Corps immediately.

Through wrestling, he has learned diligence, perseverance and confidence, which will undoubtedly serve him well as he strives to become a member of the Marines.

Mr. Speaker, Joey Daniel has more than proven that he is an extraordinary student athlete with no limits to his potential. I am beyond proud to honor Joey Daniel.

KENNEDI LAUBERT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kennedy Laubert for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Kennedy Laubert received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kennedy Laubert is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kennedy Laubert for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

NEVER TOO LATE—TEXAS SPIRIT

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride to give special recognition to the accomplishments and sacrifices made by an extraordinary woman from Houston—Leshia Champs. After facing incredible challenges in her life, Ms. Champs has risen to not only empower herself, but other women facing similar difficulties. At the age of 33, this single mother of 5 just graduated from Thurgood Marshall School of Law. Despite dropping out of high school, getting laid off, being homeless, losing her children's father to cancer, losing her mom to cancer, and losing her home to a fire Ms. Champs did not quit. In 2009, she earned her GED and began to turn her life around. She gives all the credit to her children and her faith in God.

Last month, Ms. Champs found herself in the dead center of the media's attention. She posted a photo with her five children, wearing a cap and gown, while holding a chalk board sign that said, "I did it!"

Her children held chalkboard signs stating "We did it!" and "I helped". The photo went viral, giving others hope.

Ms. Champs grew up in the foster care system and struggled with thoughts of killing herself. She found hope in God and strength in her children. Some people would say that she beat the odds, but I believe her passion, determination, and resilient attitude along with her faith in God ensured her the talent to finish law school. It wasn't easy. Her kids helped

her studies. They quizzed her with flash cards and even served as her mock jury. A family that practices law together, stays together.

We are all faced with challenges and choices, some more difficult than others, but the understanding that each person is responsible for their actions and their own pursuit of the American dream is the best building blocks we can give to our children.

On behalf of the Second Congressional District of Texas, I want to congratulate Ms. Champs for setting an example to her children and giving hope to other women who are facing similar challenges.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF CEDAR FALLS HIGH
SCHOOL ROCKET CLUB

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor an accomplished group of students from Cedar Falls, Iowa. The Cedar Falls High School Rocket Club has a six-member team, consisting of Ryan Ritter, Will Burken, Erik Walther, Andre Bryan, Randev Gooneseker, and Duncan Myer.

As a result of their performance in a 2017 national student rocket competition, the Cedar Falls High School team was one of only 15 high school teams chosen to participate in a NASA-hosted student launch this past April.

With the guidance of University of Northern Iowa student Ryan Holzaphel, mentor Tyler Sorenson, and High School teacher and advisor Zeb Nicholson, the team spent many hours preparing to launch their 8-foot-tall, high-powered fiberglass rocket from NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Alabama. In addition to the student rocket launch, these students heard from a number of speakers, toured the Marshall Space Flight Center, and underwent a series of rocketry reviews to ensure their rocket was ready for flight.

The Cedar Falls High School Rocket Club team consists of intelligent and motivated students who deserve recognition for their efforts, ingenuity, and interest in science. This group of young men exemplifies the incredible talent and innovation that students in Iowa's First District have to offer.

KULANI MARTIN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kulani Martin for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Kulani Martin received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kulani Martin is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and

develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kulani Martin for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

CONGRATULATING THE
KEESEVILLE VOLUNTEER FIRE
DEPARTMENT ON THE GRAND
OPENING OF ITS NEW FIRE STA-
TION

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Keeseville Volunteer Fire Department on the grand opening of its new fire station.

The Keeseville Volunteer Fire Department has been providing firefighting and EMS services for the Towns of Chesterfield and AuSable since it was first established in 1878. For the past 140 years, the Fire Department has fought to protect and serve the people of these communities. Most recently, Keeseville's volunteer firefighters provided excellent first-response services to hundreds of families who lost power from a windstorm. As a member of the Clinton County and Essex County Mutual Aid Systems, the Fire Department also assists with emergencies throughout both counties.

In late 2015, the public voted in a referendum to renovate and expand the Fire Department's outdated fire station. The project added four new bays, creating enough room to fit all the Fire Department's vehicles inside the station. Additionally, the structural foundation was reinforced and the parking lot expanded and repaved. With these improvements, our dedicated firefighters will be better suited to continue to serve their community.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to congratulate the Keeseville Volunteer Fire Department as it opens its new fire station. We are grateful for the firefighters' service, and hope that this new station will serve as a suitable home for many years to come.

SUPPORTING ROBUST RELATIONS
WITH THE STATE OF ISRAEL BI-
LATERALLY AND IN MULTILAT-
ERAL FORA UPON SEVENTY
YEARS OF STATEHOOD

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS STEWART

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 2018

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to add my voice along with my colleagues' to congratulate the state of Israel on its 70th anniversary. From its humble beginnings, Israel has faced insurmountable odds but has prevailed.

Israel is a light in the region and an example of democracy and opportunity. From its technological advances to its cultural wonders,

Israel continue to improve and impress the world.

Since the United States formally recognized the state of Israel in 1948, the US-Israeli relationship has only strengthened. Israel has proven itself to be a key ally politically, militarily, and economically.

Ultimately, I have had the opportunity to personally visit Israel many times and can sincerely say that its greatest asset is its people.

My sincerest well wishes on this special occasion.

YOSSELIN SILVA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Yosselin Silva for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Yosselin Silva received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Yosselin Silva is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Yosselin Silva for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PROTECTING OUR ANGELS
ABROAD

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Representative KENNEDY and I introduced the Sam Farr Peace Corps Enhancement Act to protect our Peace Corps volunteers, our angels abroad.

This bill builds on and extends protections for volunteers that became law as the result of the Kate Puzey Act which I introduced and finally became law in 2011. H.R. 2259 protects volunteers at every stage of their service with the Peace Corps: the onboarding process, their time in country, and when they return home.

Before they make a decision regarding where to serve, many potential volunteers are not fully aware of critical information like health risks and crime rates in various countries. This bill requires the Peace Corps to provide this information to volunteers upfront so that they can make an informed decision regarding where to serve.

While they are deployed in country, the bill requires that the Peace Corps ensures volunteers have access to qualified medical doctors. These doctors must consult with outside experts and the Center for Disease Control (CDC) on best practices, particularly on mental health and malaria medications that can

have serious long-term side effects. We also added important provisions on protection from sexual assault and harassment recommended by the Office of Special Counsel report released earlier this year.

When volunteers return home from their service with debilitating injuries and illnesses, they should not have to spend months dealing with bureaucratic red tape at the Department of Labor before receiving care. This bill will ensure they immediately receive the care they need and deserve.

These common sense changes will make a big difference in ensuring the safety and security of our volunteers. But this bill is just a first step in protecting our volunteers.

I fought long and hard for a provision that unfortunately did not make it into the legislation that passed out of the House Foreign Affairs Committee today: to increase the disability payment provided to disabled returned volunteers so they can make ends meet. This important provision enjoyed broad support from Peace Corps volunteer groups, including Health Justice for Peace Corps and the National Peace Corps Association. I hope that this provision will one day become law. However, until then, the improvements in this bill are essential and valuable for our angels abroad.

A crucial provision that did make it in here was the extension of the authorization of the Sexual Assault Advisory Council for an additional 5 years. The Council was initially authorized by the Kate Puzey Act and serves to advise the Peace Corps on agency wide sexual assault policy. Without this important bill, the council's authority would lapse this year.

Peace Corps volunteers selflessly sacrifice years of their lives to help people they have never even met. Often in some of the most desolate, even dangerous, places of the world. They are the face of our country in places where America's shining beacon of hope and liberty may not always shine so bright. Their service to our country should not turn into a nightmare that ruins, or even ends their lives.

As a former judge, I can tell you that it is our duty to do everything within our power to protect our angels abroad. It's time to stand up and take action for our volunteers. They are some of the very best we have.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING TEMPLE SHOLOM

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 150th Anniversary of Temple Sholom in the Lakeview neighborhood of Chicago, IL. Temple Sholom plays a critical role in the Reform movement in my home city of Chicago and throughout the world.

Founded in 1867, Temple Sholom is one of the oldest synagogues in the city. At the time, most Jewish institutions were located on the south side of Chicago, and Temple Sholom filled that neighborhood void by establishing a new community on the North Side. Having faced the Great Chicago Fire of 1871 and endured moves to several other locations over the years, the beautiful lakeside plot that is

home to the synagogue today proves that this institution is so much more than one building or address.

During the Civil Rights movement, Temple Sholom joined forces with a variety of religious groups to stand strong in defense of equal rights for all people—regardless of race. On October 21, 1964, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. spoke to Chicago and the world from the sanctuary at Temple Sholom, which drew crowds from people of all denominations and backgrounds. Temple Sholom actively supports the same ideals of inclusion, diversity, and opportunity for all to this day.

The success of this congregation and its positive impact on the community is the direct result of the commitment and passion of its clergy, staff, and members. For 150 years, Temple Sholom has provided a place of comfort during painful times, a place of celebration during momentous occasions, and always, a safe, hospitable place for reflection and prayer. This institution continues to advance the vibrancy of the 5th Congressional District's diverse community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 150th Anniversary of Temple Sholom. I offer my sincere congratulations to Rabbi Edwin Goldberg, Rabbi Scott Gellman, Associate Rabbi Shoshanah Conover, Cantor Sheera Ben-David, and Board President Marc Kaufman, the congregation's past and present staff, and the congregates who are celebrating this important milestone. I wish all the best in the years ahead and hope for another 150 years of important work for Temple Sholom.

RACHELLE KARDISCO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Rachelle Kardisco for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Rachelle Kardisco received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Rachelle Kardisco is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Rachelle Kardisco for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE CINCINNATI ENQUIRER'S 2018 PULITZER PRIZE

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the staff of the Cincinnati Enquirer for their coverage of the opioid epi-

demic in Greater Cincinnati, a story which earned them the 2018 Pulitzer Prize in Local Reporting.

Their remarkable coverage of the opioid epidemic brought the severity of our region's plight to the nation's attention. The wide-ranging scope of the Enquirer's story—encompassing addiction, arrests, overdose, even pregnancy and birth—demonstrates just how pervasive and troubling the consequences of the opioid crisis are for millions of Americans.

A call to attention can often be a first step toward solving a problem like the opioid epidemic. In fact, resources for law enforcement, health care professionals, and mental health counselors to fight this epidemic have become more readily available than ever.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you'll join me in congratulating the Cincinnati Enquirer.

CELEBRATING LUNDBERG FAMILY FARMS 80TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lundberg Family Farms on the celebration of its 80th anniversary.

Since its founding in 1937 by Albert and Frances Lundberg, the rice-growing company has expanded substantially, now producing 18 different varieties of rice and many other rice products. Lundberg has become a national leader in the marketplace, and is growing quickly internationally.

This third-generation family business has strengthened our region's vibrant agricultural sector and created jobs throughout the Sacramento Valley. Even through substantial growth, Lundberg has continued using sustainable practices, ensuring that generations to come can further its rich farming tradition.

On behalf of the people of California's Third District, I congratulate Lundberg Family Farms on its 80th anniversary, and I know that our entire region joins me in wishing them continued success in the years ahead.

HONORING SPC. MICHAEL LIMA ON BEING NAMED 10TH MOUNTAIN DIVISION SOLDIER OF THE YEAR

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Spc. Michael Lima on being named the 10th Mountain Division Soldier of the Year at Fort Drum, New York.

Each year, Fort Drum holds a competition for the prestigious title of Soldier of the Year. The competition features an Army Physical Fitness Test, land navigation, marksmanship competition, an obstacle course, a six-mile road march and other strategy and endurance tests. This year, the title goes to Spc. Michael Lima, an infantryman for the 3rd Squadron, 71st Cavalry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team in the 10th Mountain Division.

On behalf of the 21st District of New York, I would like to congratulate Spc. Michael Lima

on winning this esteemed title. Spc. Lima will now go on to represent the 10th Mountain Division in the XVIII Airborne Corps Soldier of the Year competition. I wish him the best of luck and want to extend my thanks for his dedicated service to the United States.

TRIBUTE TO MS. FLORENCE BASS

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and extend my sincerest wishes to a remarkable woman, Ms. Florence Bass. Florence was born in the heart of Brooklyn, New York and throughout her life, broke down gender barriers in education and military service.

Growing up in the early 20th century, Florence remembers a life in Brooklyn filled with horse-drawn fire trucks, unpaved roads and time helping at her family's neighborhood candy store. Raised in a family that valued education, Florence was fortunate to attend many great schools, including New York University.

Later moving to New Orleans to attend Tulane University, Florence earned a Masters Degree in Social Work. At the start of World War II, she returned to New York City serving as a social worker to the Auxiliary Military Hospital Services. As one point, she was stationed at the historic Brooklyn Navy Yard, a pivotal site that's importance to the American's efforts earned it the nickname "the Can-Do Yard."

After the war, Florence worked for the Jewish Family and Children's Resettlement program to help refugees. Now at 104, Florence is a beloved community member living in Brooklyn Heights. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Florence Bass for her lifetime of hard work and service.

RECOGNIZING MAY AS GBS/CIDP AWARENESS MONTH

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of May as GBS/CIDP Awareness Month. Guillain-Barré Syndrome (GBS) is an inflammatory disorder of the peripheral nerves outside the brain and spinal cord and is characterized by the rapid onset of numbness, weakness, and often paralysis of the legs, arms, breathing muscles, and face. Chronic Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyneuropathy (CIDP) is a rare disorder of the peripheral nerves characterized by gradually increasing sensory loss and weakness associated with loss of reflexes. The number of new cases per year of CIDP is about 1–2 per 100,000 people, but can be as high as 9 per 100,000 in some areas.

Founded by Estelle Benson, the GBS/CIDP Foundation International is the preeminent global non-profit organization supporting individuals and their families affected by Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS), chronic inflammatory

demyelinating polyneuropathy (CIDP), and related syndromes such as multifocal motor neuropathy (MMN) through a commitment to, education, research, and advocacy. I know firsthand the importance of the foundation's work; two of my daughters and a granddaughter have contracted Guillain-Barré Syndrome (GBS). The foundation provided us, as it does with all patients, a critical community of medical specialists and survivors and their families to ensure that all three were given the best treatment and could recover as quickly as possible.

Tonight, Estelle is being honored by The National Organization for Rare Disorders (NORD) with the Abbey S. Meyers Leadership Award on behalf of the Foundation for their continued dedication to supporting patients with GBS, CIDP and related conditions. I call on my colleagues to join me in congratulating Estelle Benson and recognizing the work of the GBS/CIDP Foundation International on behalf of patients and their families.

U.S. SUGAR IS UNDER ATTACK

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, American sugar is under attack on its home turf. Despite costing taxpayers absolutely nothing for 14 of the past 15 years, some want to dismantle this program, a program—I might add—that supports 140,000 jobs in 22 states.

Countries like Mexico flood and dump into our country cheap, low quality sugar, undercutting American producers. Meanwhile, Big Candy Corporations takes advantage of these low prices then argue that their foreign competitors pay less than they do, even though the data says otherwise. The reality is that sugar prices have stagnated over the last 30 years, stumbling behind the rate of inflation and forcing producers to work on razor-thin margins.

But Big Candy wants you to think they're being treated unfairly. In the 80's—back when my hair was blonde and my right hand held a gavel—your average candy bar cost about 35-cents and contained a mere 2-cents worth of sugar.

In 2018, the average candy bar costs about a buck-fifty and still contains only 2-cents worth of sugar in. Big Candy's profits rise and they keep the little guy's cut.

That's why we need U.S. sugar policy, Mr. Speaker. In the last thirty years, half of the U.S.'s sugar operations have shut down. If Big Candy gets its way, the other half will soon follow.

I appreciate fellow Texan, Chairman CONAWAY's tireless efforts in crafting this vital legislation and preserving America's Ag industry for another five years. I oppose any action to put American sugar growers out of business.

And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GLENN THOMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 15, 2018, I was absent for the evening vote series. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 181; YEA on Roll Call No. 182; and YEA on Roll Call No. 183.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF WILBERT LANNON

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Wilbert Lannon of Cotuit, Massachusetts; who turns 100 years young on Friday, May 25th.

Wilbert has been devoted to taking care of others from an early age. After growing up in Roslindale, he displayed his devotion to family when—following his father's passing—he chose to stay home and help instead of attending the United States Military Academy at West Point.

In 1950, Wilbert served his country in the United States Army Air Corps for four years. He returned home to Roslindale and married his wife Mary. They would go on to raise two children, Elizabeth and Ferne, and spend 55 blissful years of marriage together. The Lannon Family settled in Medfield and Wilbert, a dedicated and caring father, supported his family by working in the insurance business until his retirement in 2010.

Wilbert's daughter Elizabeth speaks incredibly highly of her father, noting his compassion and dedication to taking care of others. He truly understands the value of lending a hand. In 1960, he drove his family to the New York World Fair just to see his children smile. He has dedicated his life to caring for his family and loved ones, including spending every moment taking care of his daughter, Ferne and wife, Mary when they fell ill.

Today, he lives in Cotuit, near his loving daughter Elizabeth, where he continues to lend a hand to the residents of his retirement home. Wilbert, always ready to help, is truly beloved by everyone who has the opportunity to cross his path.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Wilbert Lannon on his 100th birthday. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing him many more years of good health and happiness.

CONGRATULATING NORTH COUNTRY COMMUNITY COLLEGE ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize North Country Community College on its 50th anniversary.

North Country Community College opened its doors to students and faculty for its first classes in September of 1968. The College's first graduating class had only 17 people, with certificates in practical nursing and secretarial studies. Since then, North Country Community College has taught over 50,000 students from all over the world and offers more than 25 academic disciplines. The College also has an exceptional athletic history with multiple championship winning hockey and basketball teams, as well as over 130 outstanding athletes in the North Country Community College Athletic Hall of Fame.

North Country Community College's impact on the North Country over the past 50 years cannot go unrecognized. As the only public college in the Adirondack Park, North Country Community College prioritizes extending opportunities to students in the area and providing them with skills to foster prosperity in the local communities.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to congratulate North Country Community College on its 50th anniversary and commend the College on its commitment to education in the North Country.

CONGRATULATING DR. PAUL
OLSEN ON RETIREMENT

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Paul Olsen, who is retiring from Augustana College. Dr. Olsen has become a pillar in the Rock Island community, and he will be greatly missed.

Dr. Olsen has spent 50 plus years coaching cross country and track and field at Augustana College. He has coached a total of 234 NCAA Division III All-American runners and, 26 times, these athletes have been crowned national champions. Dr. Olsen was inducted into the Illinois Track and Field Coaches Association "Hall of Fame" in 2004 and went into the Augustana "Tribe of Vikings Hall of Fame" in 2006. Dr. Olsen is a professor in the English Department at Augustana, and is one of the most popular teachers in the entire school.

It is because of dedicated and selfless leaders such as Dr. Paul Olsen that I am especially proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Dr. Paul Olsen on his well-earned retirement and thank him for all of his contributions and service to our community.

HONORING BRAD BREITHAUPT

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Brad Breithaupt of Marin County, California, on the occasion of his retirement, for 42 years of dedication to local journalism.

Brad Breithaupt was raised in Marin County, where he attended Redwood High School and College of Marin. He then graduated with a

bachelor's degree in English from U.C. Berkeley in 1976 and began his career in local journalism that same year.

For the next three years, Brad Breithaupt served a variety of roles at The Ark newspaper in Tiburon, ranging from reporter, to editor, to publisher. By 1979, he started working for the Marin Suburban Newspaper, now known as Marinscope, and would go on to serve as a reporter there for the next 4 years.

He became the managing editor for the Ross Valley Reporter, San Rafael News Pointer, and Ignacio News.

After seven years of quality local reporting in a variety of newspaper roles, Brad Breithaupt was recruited by the Marin Independent Journal in 1983. For the next 35 years, Mr. Breithaupt remained at the Marin Independent Journal, where he served as a reporter, columnist, city editor, editorial writer, and editorial editor, among other roles.

During his time at the Marin Independent Journal, Brad Breithaupt stayed committed to balanced reporting and shining a light on causes in need of the public's attention. His work put a spotlight on local and regional topics including crime, community politics, and infrastructure hazards, driving the region's agenda and helping set priorities for the public and decision-makers.

Mr. Speaker, Brad Breithaupt's career represents more than a collection of articles, but rather a laudable example of the role that local journalism can play in informing and supporting our communities. Given the adverse conditions that local news sources increasingly face across the country, it seems fitting and appropriate to celebrate the culmination of this momentous career. Therefore, please join me in congratulating him on his retirement and expressing our deep appreciation for his long and exceptional career in local journalism.

LUPE FRAGA: A HOUSTON LEGEND

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lupe Fraga is a living Houston legend. Lupe and his family are well-known in Houston. Lupe is the owner of one of the most successful businesses in Texas, Tejas Office Products located in the Houston Heights. When reflecting on his incredible career, Lupe says he was simply in the right place at the right time, but had the guiding hand of God. Mr. Speaker, he always made the most of his incredible God-given opportunities.

Lupe was born in Second Ward on the east side of Houston, the youngest of six. As a child, another Houston legend, "Mama" Ninfa Rodriguez Lorenzo, the namesake of the world famous Ninfa's Restaurant, was like a second mother to him. This immigrant community with a warm family atmosphere, deep rooted values, and cherished relationships, shaped Lupe's life and career.

He says when he was a kid, he was a "little athletic" so he got a chance to play baseball at St. Thomas High School. Lupe took that chance and turned it into a baseball scholarship to Texas A&M University where he was a member of A Athletics and the Corps of Cadets. He excelled at school and graduated

with a degree in accounting. Upon graduation, he joined the Army, spent three years in France, earned the rank of First Lieutenant, and was honorably discharged. When he returned to Houston in the 1960s, Lupe befriended the office supply representative at his new job and at age 26 he decided to take him up on an offer to buy the office supply company. Tejas Office Products was born. Supplier diversity and Houston's inclusiveness helped Tejas grow. In the 1970's Lupe was given one account with Shell Oil Company. Never to pass on an extraordinary opportunity, Lupe grew to all nine Houston Shell locations and set the course for Tejas to become the largest independent office products company in the Houston area.

Lupe never lets anyone forget that Tejas Office Products is a family-run business. His three children have roles in the company. Lupe's son Stephen describes him as not only a loving father, but a trusted mentor who loves people and believes in giving back. He never forgot his east end roots. "Dad always told us the community raises the child, he inspired me and my siblings to serve, he wanted all of us to help the community."

Lupe took people under his wing and made sure to offer them opportunities like he had. He gladly introduced people into the community and helped them make connections. Because he believed so strongly in education, he took pride in helping Father T.J. Martinez make the connections he needed to start Cristo Rey Jesuit School. A quiet leader, Lupe would say, "My mother always taught me, be nice to people, not expecting anything in return. Just be a good person and do it for the right reasons."

Mr. Speaker, Stephen also told me, "Dad taught me about relationships. He liked to get to know people and be good to people. He knew about the value of relationships and client satisfaction before there were any books on the subject." He was a pioneer in customer relationship building and believed that even with technology, people want to buy from people. Even with the emergence of big box retailers, Lupe found a way to innovate but stay independent, creating a partnership with a national office supply retailer to serve Fortune 50 and Fortune 500 clients.

Lupe has earned many accolades and achievements in his life including serving on the Texas A&M Board of Regents, Chairman of the Board of the Federal Reserve Bank Houston, Director and Executive Committee Member at the Greater Houston Partnership, and Chairman Emeritus of the Houston Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. He has been honored with many awards including Distinguished Alumnus of Texas A&M, 2015 Texas A&M Athletics Hall of Fame Lifetime Achievement Award, Mays Business School Outstanding Alumnus, Fathers of the Year award presented by Community Partners in Greater Houston, and the 2012 State of Texas Small Business Award.

Lupe and his wife Irene have three children and five grandchildren. He loves his Aggies and his Astros and spending time with his grandkids. Looking back on his success, Lupe has said, "It's been an experience of people, it's not me, I've got to say that. It's about the people that have helped, the people who have encouraged, the people that have been there for you. That's what's done it. I take no credit."

Well, today I rise in the House of Representatives to give Lupe the credit. Credit for his impact on business, his impact on Texas A&M, his impact on his community and his family.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING MR. AARON ELSTER

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of an integral member of the Chicago community.

On April 11th, we lost a dedicated leader of the Jewish faith. Mr. Aaron Elster, Vice President of the Illinois Holocaust Museum and a Holocaust Survivor passed away at the age of 86 on Holocaust Remembrance Day, Yom HaShoah.

Mr. Elster worked tirelessly to ensure that the history of the Holocaust was not forgotten. He sought to provide all those he met with a greater understanding of what this tragedy meant for the victims, the survivors, their descendants, and the entire world—both then and now.

He was open about his personal experiences, recollections, and lessons learned—deciding to share these dark times with others in order to inspire a deeper sense of compassion and civility, while illustrating the dangers of intolerance.

During the holocaust, Aaron lived in the Sokolow Ghetto with his two sisters, mother, and father until the closing of the ghetto in September of 1942. He was able to escape the liquidation by hiding in surrounding farms until eventually seeking refuge in the attic of a Polish family's home, where he hid for two years until the end of the war. Only Aaron and his older sister, Irene, survived before eventually being smuggled out of Poland to DP Camps in Western Germany.

Aaron and his sister arrived in the United States in June of 1947. He was educated in Chicago and then went on to serve in the U.S. Armed Forces in Korea. He was the co-author of "I Still See Her Haunting Eyes," which chronicled the unfathomable atrocities and heartbreak he endured throughout one of the darkest times in our entire world history. Aaron spoke regularly to student groups and was especially dedicated to the Holocaust Museum's Brill Law Enforcement Action in Democracy Training, where he shared his childhood experiences with Chicago Law Enforcement Officers, helping them to understand their responsibilities while working to protect and serve our diverse community.

I echo the sentiments made by the CEO of the Holocaust Museum, Susan Abrams, when she wrote the following in Mr. Elster's Obituary: "Aaron was an incredible communicator, able to empathize with all walks of life—students, police officers, any group who visited the museum. Aaron spoke about his experience in the Holocaust with such emotion that you could not help but be moved and have a desire to act and make the world a better place."

Luckily, future generations will have the privilege of hearing Aaron Elster's story through his interactive hologram, which can be

viewed at the Illinois Holocaust Museum's "Take a Stand" Center. He was one of fifteen survivors selected worldwide, a tremendous honor, of which he was incredibly—and justifiably—very proud.

Mr. Elster is survived by his wife, Jacqueline, two sons, and three grandchildren. Today, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in honoring and celebrating the rich life and many accomplishments of Mr. Aaron Elster.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARYBETH SHEA

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Marybeth Shea as she is named the 2018 Citizen of the Year by the Norwell Chamber of Commerce.

Marybeth is a pillar of the community, serving on seventeen boards and committees and being a staple in town politics and events. For thirty years, she has put the people of Norwell first, always trying to figure out how to better her community.

After first moving to Norwell, Marybeth immediately become involved in the Parent-Teacher Organization. Marybeth has stepped up at every point to improve our school and our community.

Marybeth spent eight years as president of the Norwell High School Boosters Committee, where she planned fundraisers and headed countless initiatives, including the creation of the Norwell High School Athletic Hall of Fame. She made every opportunity to advocate for the students of Norwell and worked to ensure their incredible athletic accomplishments would long be remembered.

Outside of school, Marybeth has become a familiar face in local politics and does not miss an opportunity to advocate and inform others about issues that have a direct impact on the town of Norwell.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Marybeth Shea for her dedication to her community. I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking her for her work and wishing her all the best as she continues her efforts.

HONORING STAFF SGT. CAIN PAVLAK FOR BEING NAMED NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICER OF THE YEAR

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Staff Sgt. Cain Pavlak on being named the 10th Mountain Division Noncommissioned Officer of the Year.

Each year, Fort Drum holds a competition for the prestigious title of Noncommissioned Officer of the Year. The competition features an Army Physical Fitness Test, land navigation, marksmanship competition, an obstacle course, a six-mile road march and other strategy and endurance tests. This year, the title goes to Staff Sgt. Cain Pavlak, a cavalry scout

for the 1st Squadron, 89th Cavalry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team in the 10th Mountain Division.

On behalf of the 21st District of New York, I would like to congratulate Staff Sgt. Cain Pavlak on winning this esteemed title. We are thankful to Staff Sgt. Pavlak for his dedicated service to the United States.

35TH ANNIVERSARY OF CYPRESS HILLS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the leadership and staff of Cypress Hills Local Development Corporation (CHLDC) on their 35th anniversary. This non-profit organization located in the Cypress Hills and East New York community was created in 1983 at the height of a nationwide grassroots movement to preserve and improve urban communities.

Today, after thirty-five years of dedication and commitment, CHLDC has helped transform Cypress Hills into a robust and thriving community. CHLDC works to provide crucial services such as: economic development; homeownership and housing development; entrepreneurship; education services; public safety; and open space. CHLDC has championed many projects from helping to create the first dual language school to developing more than 400 affordable housing units across the neighborhood. Thanks to their help, numerous hardworking local families have been able to realize the American Dream of homeownership.

On this 35th anniversary, I would like to take the opportunity to commend Michelle Neugebauer, Executive Director, Mr. Harold Green, Board President, staff and members for their tireless and unconditional commitment to our community.

KINGWOOD HIGH SCHOOL WORLD DEBATERS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is always a privilege to be able to recognize the achievements and hard work of outstanding students in my community. As the 2017–2018 school year is winding down, two students from Kingwood High School are just getting warmed up.

Emily Grantham and Leila Saklou, Kingwood High School eleventh graders, have earned two of the five spots on Team USA at the World Schools Debate Championships. Competing in debate tournaments at Cornell University, Harvard University, Los Angeles, Germany, Croatia, and Taiwan, Emily and Leila have traveled the world.

Debate creates leaders. I also commend Emily and Leila's debate team and their coaches at Kingwood High School. Young men and women of all backgrounds have

come together, working as a team, to accomplish a single goal. This teamwork serves as an example for all of us. Congress should take notice of this squad.

The World Schools Debate Championships will be held this summer in Croatia from July 17 to July 27. More than 50 countries compete at this 10 day global competition for high school debate teams each year, discussing 13 diverse topics such as politics, philosophy, technology, and law. This global event promotes excellence, creativity, and critical thinking. Emily and Leila's success in the world class event is inspiring.

As a past patron of the World Schools Debate Championships, Nelson Mandela, said, "A winner is a dreamer who never gives up". Emily and Leila are already winners in my book, and have demonstrated an exceptionally high standard of excellence and talent. These girls have earned the distinction of representing not only Texas, but the United States. I know they will represent us with pride and dignity. Congratulations to Emily and Leila for their outstanding achievements. My best wishes are with them this summer.

Go Team USA, and Kingwood Strong.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING PAM ROMANO

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend from Jefferson, Pam Romano—a tireless advocate for adoptive families and children around the world.

In 2012, Pam and her husband Mark began the process of adopting two Russian brothers, Bogdon and Yura. In the same year, though, Russia enforced a ban on adoptions to the United States, separating the Romanos from their sons.

Since then, Pam and her husband Mark have assisted children caught in the crosshairs of this ban—like their two sons—by raising awareness on the issues dividing adoptive families. By meeting with lawmakers and sharing her family's story with others, Pam hopes to one day reunite with Bogdon and Yura.

Last year, the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute honored Pam as an Angel in Adoption, a title given to leaders who have made extraordinary strides in helping children in need of a family. Moreover, her efforts inspired me to recently introduce the Inter-country Adoption Information Act—a bill designed to bring transparency to the international adoption landscape, where families often struggle to access up-to-date, accurate information they need to navigate the adoption process.

Pam's efforts to bring her children home reminds us of the unwavering power of a mother's love. I'm grateful for her dedication to bridging the bureaucratic gaps between families and their adopted children.

IN RECOGNITION OF GENERAL H.R. MCMASTER

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Lieutenant General H.R. McMaster. General McMaster has served in our military honorably for 34 years, and our country is better for it.

I first met General McMaster during our time at the United States Military Academy. General McMaster was my squad leader for Cadet Basic Training, known as "Beast Barracks." General McMaster, being from Pennsylvania, was amused by my then-Alabama accent. He gave me the nickname Huckleberry, which is how I am still referred to by my West Point classmates.

General McMaster was an excellent leader as a senior cadet, and he went on to be a highly decorated soldier as a junior officer in the first Gulf War. As he moved up the ranks in the my, he continued to be an outstanding leader, commanding troops overseas in Iraq. I was pleased when President Trump nominated General McMaster to be National Security Advisor and think he did a fantastic job in that role.

I wholeheartedly agree with those who have called General McMaster the "greatest soldier of his generation." It was an honor to serve under his leadership at West Point and I wish him all the best in his retirement. I hope it includes a lot of time spent reading and enjoying the comfort of his famous Hawaiian shirts.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION
ACT OF 2018

SPEECH OF

HON. DWIGHT EVANS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 2018

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes:

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018. When Ranking Member PETERSON, who has done four Farm Bills and is one of the most moderate in our Caucus, is upset with the process and the result, it tells you that the well has been poisoned. But let me tell you a little about me and why I chose to be on the Agriculture Committee.

I came from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania where I was proud to serve as Chairman of the state legislature's Appropriations Committee for twenty years.

There, I was able to secure billions of dollars for state programs that addressed urban and rural needs, roads and bridges, schools, the first Healthy Food Financing Initiative, and most importantly, many, many Agriculture programs around the entire state of Pennsylvania.

We should be in the business of first doing no harm, but here we are trying to pass off the

Farm Bill as bipartisan, when in fact, this is an assault on the working poor, the disadvantaged, seniors, and veterans.

Mr. Speaker, in Pennsylvania that would translate to an additional 199,000 individuals between the ages of 50 to 59 who would face cuts to their SNAP benefits. It is more difficult for older individuals to find work when unemployed and many people want to work more than 25 hours, but simply cannot due to lack of available hours, children, or age.

Almost 2 million Pennsylvanians benefit from the SNAP, with over 215,000 in my District alone, and with the majority of benefits going to those in great need. This bill before us is unworkable for Philadelphia. It fails them, the process fails them, and for that I give this bill an F.

HONORING LLOYD KNIGHT

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lloyd Knight. Lloyd was recently awarded the Jim Casey Community Service Award—one of the highest awards given to United Parcel Service employees.

Lloyd has been a part of the UPS team for over 10 years, joining the company after spending 20 years in the United States Air Force. Over his time at UPS, he rose to the position of Global Forwarding Freight Director and founded the UPS Veterans Business Resource Group.

A veteran himself, Lloyd helped found VETLANTA, an organization committed to bringing together the business community, non-profits, and government to help make the Atlanta region the best destination in the country for veterans. Additionally, Lloyd dedicates his spare time to veterans through his involvement in Hire Heroes USA and American Corporate Partners.

Lloyd has served both his country and neighbors in Georgia through his tireless service, leaving a lasting impact on local veterans and his community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Lloyd for the compassion he has shown others and congratulate him on this well-deserved honor.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 10th 2018, I experienced a family emergency and so I missed Roll Call vote number 178 regarding the "Titus Amendment" (A003). Had I been present, I would have voted "Yes." I also missed Roll Call vote number 179 regarding the "Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018" (H.R. 3053). Had I been present, I would have voted "No."

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MRS. DORIS MARGARET WARD

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a passionate civil rights activist, committed community servant, and my dear friend—Doris Margaret Ward. She embodied the ideal of what it means to be a true public servant and to selflessly give of her time and talents for the betterment of others.

The Honorable Doris Ward graduated from Froebel High School, of Gary, Indiana, where she mastered the art of debating, helping her debate team win a championship while serving as team leader. She, later, earned both her Bachelor's and Master's Degrees in Education from the University of Indiana. She continued her education by earning a Master's Degree in Counseling from the San Francisco State University of California. It was there that her passion for social activism blossomed as she joined other students during sit-in protests. This experience led her to become the President of the Indianapolis National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's (NAACP) Metropolitan Council.

Doris also taught in the Indianapolis School District before marrying a law student by the name of John Ward. After moving to San Francisco in 1968, she became a Trustee of the San Francisco Community College District.

Later on, in 1979, Doris was elected to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Eleven short years later, she became the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' first African American President.

In 1996, Doris was first appointed to, and then elected as the San Francisco County Assessor Recorder. She retired in 2006 with a remarkable, long-term record of political activism. Doris is a Founding Member of the San Francisco Chapter of 100 Black Women Incorporated, and Black Women Stirring the Waters. She led the African-American Action Network and served as Board Vice President of the Black Coalition on AIDS, which later became the Rafiki Coalition for Health and Wellness. Of Mrs. Ward's numerous accomplishments and accolades, what brought her the most joy was her sponsorship and co-sponsorship of legislation governing minority businesses, rent control mandates for San Francisco apartment vacancies, and the divestiture in South Africa's apartheid.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the entire Ward family, Mrs. Ward's friends, and her admirers. There are many whose lives were greatly enhanced by the endless service, the profound graciousness, and the pure love that she carried in her heart and soul. It is my hope that the outpouring of love that surrounds her loved ones gives you all the strength to embrace each coming day with a spirit of strength and peace.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally recognize Mrs. Doris Ward's 86 years of life and the tremendous impact she has had throughout. Her record of political and social activism is only superseded by her incredible

compassion to fight for those that could not fight for themselves. I ask all my colleagues to join me in celebrating her life and in honoring the outstanding legacy she has left for all of us to remember her by.

CONGRATULATING THE JOHNSON HIGH SCHOOL SOCCER TEAM

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Johnson High School boys' soccer team on winning the state title. This honor marks the first state championship in the program's history.

A few years ago, the Knights suffered a tough defeat in the 2014 championship game, and, in 2016, a loss in the first round of the playoffs prevented the team from advancing to the title match up.

Seeking redemption, the Knights powered through the playoffs and earned a rematch against McIntosh High School, a team that bested the Knights during the regular season.

This victory testifies to the team's determination and the support they've received from Gainesville residents.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to congratulate the Knights on their hard-earned success, and I look forward to seeing what next season has in store for this team.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate confirmed the nomination of Gina Haspel, of Kentucky, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2735–S2780

Measures Introduced: Fourteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2872–2885, and S. Res. 515–516. **Page S2773**

Measures Passed:

National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System Act: Senate passed S. 346, to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System, after agreeing to the committee amendments, and the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S2776–78**

McConnell (for Murkowski) Amendment No. 2252, to modify the authorization of appropriations. **Pages S2777–78**

Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: Committee on Rules and Administration was discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 60, providing for the reappointment of Barbara M. Barrett as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and the resolution was then passed. **Page S2778**

70th Anniversary of the Reactivation in 1948 of the 3d Infantry Regiment: Senate agreed to S. Res. 515, honoring the 70th anniversary of the reactivation in 1948 of the 3d Infantry Regiment of the United States Army. **Page S2778**

National Physical Education and Sport Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 516, designating the week of May 1 through May 7, 2018, as “National Physical Education and Sport Week”. **Page S2778**

Measures Considered:

Budget Resolution: By 21 yeas to 76 nays (Vote No. 99), Senate rejected Paul motion to proceed to consideration of S. Con. Res. 36, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the

United States Government for fiscal year 2019 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2020 through 2028. **Pages S2736–48**

Prior to the consideration of this measure, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S2735**

House Messages:

Veterans Cemetery Benefit Correction Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the amendment of the House to S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, after agreeing to the motion to proceed, and taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S2761–62, S2762–68**

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill. **Page S2761**

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 2246 (to the House Amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date. **Page S2761**

McConnell Amendment No. 2247 (to Amendment No. 2246), of a perfecting nature. **Page S2761**

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 2248, to change the enactment date. **Pages S2761–62**

McConnell Amendment No. 2249 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2248), of a perfecting nature. **Page S2762**

McConnell Amendment No. 2250 (to Amendment No. 2249), of a perfecting nature. **Page S2762**

A motion was entered to close further debate on McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of

the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Dana Baiocco, of Ohio, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission. **Pages S2778–79**

Prior to the consideration of this measure today, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S2761**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments to the House message to accompany the bill be at 5 p.m., on Monday, May 21, 2018.

Pages S2778–79

Messages from the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a social security totalization agreement with Iceland, titled “Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland” and the accompanying legally binding administrative arrangement titled “Administrative Arrangement between the Competent Authorities of the United States of America and Iceland for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland”; which was referred to the Committee on Finance. (PM–38) **Page S2772**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a social security totalization agreement with Slovenia, titled “Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia” and the accompanying legally binding administrative arrangement titled “Administrative Arrangement between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic Slovenia”; which was referred to the Committee on Finance. (PM–39)

Page S2772

Baiocco Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Dana Baiocco, of Ohio, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission. **Page S2761**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, May 17, 2018, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, May 21, 2018. **Page S2761**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S2761**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S2761**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the nomination at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, May 21, 2018; and that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the cloture motions filed on Thursday, May 17, 2018 ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, May 21, 2018. **Pages S2778–79**

McWilliams Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. **Page S2762**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the House message to accompany S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks. **Page S2762**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S2762**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S2762**

McWilliams Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. **Page S2762**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. **Page S2762**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S2762**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S2762**

Evans Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of James Randolph Evans, of Georgia, to be Ambassador to Luxembourg, Department of State. **Page S2762**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to

be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. **Page S2762**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S2762**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S2762**

Montgomery Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Brian D. Montgomery, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; and that there be four hours of debate, equally divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination, with no intervening action or debate.

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 101), Gina Haspel, of Kentucky, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. **Pages S2735, S2748–61**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 54 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 100), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S2735, S2748–60**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Pages S2735, S2748

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

- 67 Army nominations in the rank of general.
- 7 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral.
- 2 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.
- 1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Navy.

Pages S2779–80

Messages from the House: **Pages S2772–73**

Measures Referred: **Page S2773**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S2742, S2773**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S2773**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2773–75**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2775–76**

Additional Statements: **Pages S2770–72**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S2776**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S2776**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—101) **Pages S2747, S2760–61**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 5:10 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, May 21, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S2778–79.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: AIR FORCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of the Air Force, after receiving testimony from Heather Wilson, Secretary of the Air Force, and General David L. Goldfein, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, both of the Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the National Institutes of Health, after receiving testimony from Francis S. Collins, Director, Norman Sharpless, Director, National Cancer Institute, Walter Koroshetz, Director, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, Anthony Fauci, Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, Richard Hodes, Director, National Institute on Aging, and Nora Volkow, Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse, all of the National Institutes of Health.

APPROPRIATIONS: FCC AND FTC

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2019 for the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission, after receiving testimony from Ajit Pai, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; and Joseph Simons, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 436, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to retire coal preference right lease applications for which the Secretary has made an affirmative commercial quantities determination, to substitute certain land selections of the Navajo Nation, to designate certain wilderness areas, with an amendment;

S. 440, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 612, and H.R. 1547, bills to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Tucson, Arizona, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversionary interest to the City;

S. 930, to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for customers, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1030, to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to submit to Congress a report on certain hydropower projects, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1142, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1459, to establish Fort Sumter and Fort Moultrie National Park in the State of South Carolina, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1573, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to place signage on Federal land along the trail known as the “American Discovery Trail”, with an amendment;

S. 1645, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of P.S. 103 in West Baltimore, Maryland;

S. 1646, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of President Station in Baltimore, Maryland, with an amendment;

S. 2074, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2102, to clarify the boundary of Acadia National Park, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 4609, to provide for the conveyance of a Forest Service site in Dolores County, Colorado, to be used for a fire station;

S. 2857, to designate the Nordic Museum in Seattle, Washington, as the “National Nordic Museum”;

H.R. 497, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain non-Federal lands;

H.R. 965, to redesignate the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site as the “Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park”;

H.R. 995, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to modernize terms in certain regulations, with amendments;

H.R. 1900, to designate the Veterans Memorial and Museum in Columbus, Ohio, as the National Veterans Memorial and Museum;

H.R. 2582, to authorize the State of Utah to select certain lands that are available for disposal under the Pony Express Resource Management Plan to be used for the support and benefit of State institutions;

H.R. 2768, to designate certain mountain peaks in the State of Colorado as “Fowler Peak” and “Boskoff Peak”;

H.R. 2786, to amend the Federal Power Act with respect to the criteria and process to qualify as a qualifying conduit hydropower facility, with an amendment;

H.R. 2897, to authorize the Mayor of the District of Columbia and the Director of the National Park Service to enter into cooperative management agreements for the operation, maintenance, and management of units of the National Park System in the District of Columbia, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nomination of Aimee Kathryn Jorjani, of Wisconsin, to be Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

AMERICA'S WATER INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 2800, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, after receiving testimony from R.D. James, Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of Defense.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 17 public bills, H.R. 5857–5873; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 901–903 were introduced. **Pages H4208–09**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H4210**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative DesJarlais to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4141**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:09 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4148**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Monsignor John Zenz, Holy Name Parish, Birmingham, Michigan. **Pages H4148–49**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 217 yeas to 188 nays with two answering "present", Roll No. 192. **Pages H4149, H4163–64**

Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018: The House considered H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023. Consideration began yesterday, May 16th.

Pages H4164–73, H4173–88, H4188–99, H4199–201, H4201–05
Agreed to:

Herrera-Beutler amendment (No. 10 printed in part C of H. Rept. 115–677) that directs the payment of a portion of stewardship project revenues to the county in which the stewardship project occurs;

Pages H4164–65

Gosar amendment (No. 11 printed in part C of H. Rept. 115–677) that authorizes counties to be included in Good Neighbor Authority cooperative agreements and contracts in order to improve forest health and bolster watershed restoration;

Pages H4165–66

Gianforte amendment (No. 12 printed in part C of H. Rept. 115–677) that authorizes expedited salvage operations for areas burned by wildfire to salvage dead trees and reforest to prevent re-burn, provide for the utilization of burned trees, or to provide a funding source for reforestation; requires a two month environmental assessment for reforestation activities and at least 75% of the burned area be reforested;

Pages H4166–67

Pearce amendment (No. 15 printed in part C of H. Rept. 115–677) that allows the Village of Santa Clara to purchase land from the United States Forest Service that was formerly part of Fort Bayard Military Reservation;

Page H4170

LaMalfa amendment (No. 16 printed in part C of H. Rept. 115–677) that streamlines the Forest Service application process required to construct broadband infrastructure on federal land;

Pages H4170–72

Westerman amendment (No. 17 printed in part C of H. Rept. 115–677) that instructs the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior to provide Congress a yearly report tabulating the metrics surrounding wildfire prevention, including the number of acres treated and agency response time;

Page H4172

Pearce amendment (No. 18 printed in part C of H. Rept. 115–677) that reauthorizes the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program for another 10 years;

Page H4172

Tipton amendment (No. 19 printed in part C of H. Rept. 115–677) that authorizes the U.S. Forest Service to convey 3.61 acres of Forest Service Land to Dolores County, Colorado for the strict purpose of building a fire station;

Pages H4172–73

Thornberry amendment (No. 20 printed in part C of H. Rept. 115–677) that establishes Cattle and Carcass Grading Correlation and Training Centers to limit subjectivity and increase the accuracy of grading cattle across the country;

Page H4173

Conaway amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that makes technical and conforming changes, in addition to making amendments to titles IV, VI and XI of H.R. 2; these amendments consist of changes to nutrition programs, requiring consultation between USDA and NTIA on broadband loan and grant programs and establishing a food access liaison at USDA;

Pages H4177–81

LaHood amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that streamlines the sign up process for Agriculture Risk Coverage (ARC) and Price Loss Coverage (PLC) by directing the Secretary of Agriculture to change the regulatory requirements from an annual sign up to a "one and done" process for ARC and PLC only;

Page H4184

Faso amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that expands USDA's ability to assess natural resource concerns through enhanced measurement, evaluation, and reporting on conservation program outcomes;

Pages H4185–86

Fortenberry amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that provides sequencing and prioritization for volunteer visits and improves communication and coordination between USDA, USAID and implementing partners; the amendment also establishes a geographically defined crop yield metrics system and an Internet-based resource for

data and knowledge sharing among the participants, stakeholders and the public; **Pages H4188–89**

MacArthur amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that ensures that if an individual becomes ineligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program as a household member due to failure to meet the requirements under subparagraph (B), the remaining household members (including children), shall not become ineligible to apply to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program due to such individuals ineligibility; **Pages H4189–91**

Holding amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that ends eligibility for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for convicted violent rapists, pedophiles and murderers after enactment into law; **Page H4191**

González-Colón amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that requires the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a feasibility study on developing a Thrifty Food Plan to calculate the amount of the Nutritional Assistance Program for Puerto Rico; **Pages H4191–92**

Young (AK) amendment (No. 14 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that expands access to traditional foods for native populations first created in Sec. 4033 of PL 113–79; **Page H4194**

González-Colón amendment (No. 15 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that requires the Secretary of Agriculture to provide an extension of study on comparable access to Supplemental Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico; **Pages H4194–95**

Faso amendment (No. 13 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that provides states the flexibility to contract out administrative functions of SNAP (by a recorded vote of 222 ayes to 192 noes, Roll No. 196); **Pages H4192–94, H4198**

Westerman amendment (No. 13 printed in part C of H. Rept. 115–677) that requires the Forest Service to consider long-term health of our nations forests when developing collaborative management plans, and shields agency decision making from certain injunctions on sustainable forest management (by a recorded vote of 224 ayes to 191 noes, Roll No. 198); **Pages H4167–68, H4199–H4200**

Young (AK) amendment (No. 14 printed in part C of H. Rept. 115–677) that exempts all National Forests in Alaska from the U.S. Forest Service Roadless Rule (by a recorded vote of 208 ayes to 207 noes, Roll No. 199); **Pages H4168–70, H4200–01**

Turner amendment (No. 18 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that ensures that newly designated 1890 Institution's base funding is calculated by using the same formula as already established 1890 Institutions; **Pages H4203–04**

Stefanik amendment (No. 19 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that adds invasive vegetation to Section 602 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act; and **Page H4204**

Cheney amendment (No. 20 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that directs the USFS and DOI to make vacant allotments available to grazing permit or lease holders in the event of a natural disaster, conflict with wildlife, or court-issued injunction; to prevent a court injunction in the event that the federal agency is unable to make a vacant allotment available. **Pages H4204–05**

Rejected:

Foxx amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that sought to modernize and reform the sugar program by removing barriers to domestic production and implementing market reforms (by a recorded vote of 137 ayes to 278 noes, Roll No. 193); **Pages H4174–77, H4196**

McClintock amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that sought to phase out agricultural subsidies (by a recorded vote of 34 ayes to 380 noes, Roll No. 194); **Pages H4181–84, H4196–97**

McClintock amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that sought to amend SNAP work requirements to repeal geographic area waivers to allow states to exempt only 5% of SNAP recipients, set the same hour per week work requirement for married parents as for single parents, exempt parents of children under 3 instead of children under 6, and require participants in training programs to go through E Verify (by a recorded vote of 83 ayes to 330 noes, Roll No. 195); and **Pages H4186–88, H4197–98**

Biggs amendment (No. 16 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that sought to repeal the bioenergy subsidy programs established in title IX of the 2002 farm bill (by a recorded vote of 75 ayes to 340 noes, Roll No. 197). **Pages H4195–96, H4198–99**

Withdrawn:

Rogers (AL) amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that amends the Conservation Title to cap the number of CRP acres at 24 million a year. **Page H4185**

Proceedings Postponed:

Russell amendment (No. 17 printed in H. Rept. 115–679) that seeks to amends the Agricultural Risk Protection act of 2000 to prohibit the Department of Agriculture (USDA) from awarding value-added agricultural product market development grants to support the marketing of beer, wine, distilled spirits, hard cider, or other alcohol products; the amendment also rescinds \$8 million of the unobligated funds that were previously provided to USDA for grants. **Pages H4201–03**

H. Res. 891, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 5698), (S. 2372), and (H.R. 2) was agreed to yesterday, May 16th.

H. Res. 900, the rule providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 188 noes, Roll No. 191, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 190.

Pages H4150–63

Unanimous Consent Agreement: Agreed by unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 900, amendment numbered 7 printed in House Report 115–679 may be considered out of sequence.

Page H4188

Discharge Petition: Representative Doyle presented to the clerk a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of H. Res. 873, providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 129) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to “Restoring Internet Freedom” (Discharge Petition No. 11).

Presidential Messages: Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted an Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia—referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 115–125).

Page H4150

Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted an Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland—referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 115–127).

Page H4205

Senate Referral: S. 2349 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Page H4207

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H4164.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and eight recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4162, H4162–63, H4163–64, H4196, H4197, H4197–98, H4198, H4199, H4199–H4200, and H4200–01. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on the FY 2019 Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill. The FY

2019 Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill was ordered reported, as amended.

PROTECTING PRIVACY, PROMOTING DATA SECURITY: EXPLORING HOW SCHOOLS AND STATES KEEP DATA SAFE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Protecting Privacy, Promoting Data Security: Exploring How Schools and States Keep Data Safe”. Testimony was heard from David Couch, K–12 CIO and Associate Commissioner, Kentucky Office of Education Technology; Gary Lilly, Superintendent, Bristol Tennessee City Schools; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4684, the “Ensuring Access to Quality Sober Living Act of 2018”; H.R. 5329, the “Poison Center Network Enhancement Act of 2018”; H.R. 5580, the “STOP Fentanyl Deaths Act of 2018”; H.R. 5587, the “Peer Support Communities of Recovery Act”; H.R. 5795, the “Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act”; H.R. 5812, the “Creating Opportunities that Necessitate New and Enhanced Connections That Improve Opioid Navigation Strategies Act”; H.R. 5590, the “Opioid Addiction Action Plan Act”; H.R. 5603, the “Access to Telehealth Services for Opioid Use Disorder”; H.R. 5605, the “Advancing High Quality Treatment for Opioid Use Disorders in Medicare Act”; H.R. 5798, the “Opioid Screening and Chronic Pain Management Alternatives for Seniors Act”; H.R. 5804, the “Post-Surgical Injections as an Opioid Alternative Act”; H.R. 5809, the “Postoperative Opioid Prevention Act of 2018”; H.R. 5715, the “Strengthening Partnerships to Prevent Opioid Abuse Act”; H.R. 5716, the “Commit to Opioid Medical Prescriber Accountability and Safety for Seniors Act”; H.R. 5796, the “Responsible Education Achieves Care and Healthy Outcomes for Users’ Treatment Act of 2018”; H.R. 1925, the “At-Risk Youth Medicaid Protection Act of 2017”; H.R. 3192, the “CHIP Mental Health Parity Act”; H.R. 4005, the “Medicaid Reentry Act”; H.R. 4998, the “Health Insurance for Former Foster Youth Act”; H.R. 5477, the “Rural Development of Opioid Capacity Services Act”; H.R. 5583, the “Requiring Medicaid Programs to Report on All Core Behavioral Health Measures”; H.R. 5789, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicaid coverage protections for pregnant and postpartum women while receiving inpatient treatment for a substance use disorder; H.R. 5797, the “IMD CARE Act”; H.R. 5799, the “Medicaid DRUG Improvement

Act”; H.R. 5800, the “Medicaid IMD ADDITIONAL INFO Act”; H.R. 5801, the “Medicaid PARTNERSHIP Act”; H.R. 5808, the “Medicaid Pharmaceutical Home Act of 2018”; H.R. 5810, the “Medicaid Health HOME Act”; H.R. 5228, the “Stop Counterfeit Drugs by Regulating and Enhancing Enforcement Now Act”; H.R. 5752, the “Stop Illicit Drug Importation Act of 2018”; H.R. 5806, the “21st Century Tools for Pain and Addiction Treatments”; and H.R. 5811, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to post-approval study requirements for certain controlled substances, and for other purposes. H.R. 5228, H.R. 5752, H.R. 5811, H.R. 3192, H.R. 4005, H.R. 4998, H.R. 5477, H.R. 5789, H.R. 5797, H.R. 5799, H.R. 5801, H.R. 5810, H.R. 5715, H.R. 5590, H.R. 5603, H.R. 5605, H.R. 5329, H.R. 5587, and H.R. 5795 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 5806, H.R. 1925, H.R. 5583, H.R. 5800, H.R. 5808, H.R. 5716, H.R. 5796, H.R. 5798, H.R. 4684, H.R. 5580, H.R. 5804, H.R. 5809, and H.R. 5812 were ordered reported, without amendment.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT-DISASTER RECOVERY PROGRAM—STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Community Development Block Grant-Disaster Recovery Program—Stakeholder Perspectives”. Testimony was heard from Stephen Costello, Chief Resilience Officer, Office of the Mayor, Houston, Texas; Rodney Ellis, Commissioner, Harris County, Texas; Heather Lagrone, Deputy Director, Texas General Land Office; and public witnesses.

AN OVERVIEW OF HOMELESSNESS IN AMERICA

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance held a hearing entitled “An Overview of Homelessness in America”. Testimony was heard from Peter Lynn, Executive Director, Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, California; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5626, the “Intercountry Adoption Information Act of 2018”; H.R. 5754, the “Cambodia Democracy Act”; H.R. 5819, the “BURMA Act of 2018”; H.R. 1911, the “Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism Act of 2017”; H.R. 2259, the “Sam Farr Peace Corps Enhancement Act”; H.R. 4989, the “Protecting Diplomats from Surveillance Through Consumer Devices Act”; and H.R. 3030, the “Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atroc-

ities Prevention Act of 2017”. H.R. 4989 was ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 1911, H.R. 2259, H.R. 3030, H.R. 5626, H.R. 5754, and H.R. 5819 were ordered reported, as amended.

GLOBAL HEALTH SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT: LESSONS LEARNED AND WAYS FORWARD

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled “Global Health Supply Chain Management: Lessons Learned and Ways Forward”. Testimony was heard from Irene Koek, Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Global Health Bureau, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Deborah L. Birx, M.D., U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator, U.S. Special Representative for Global Health Diplomacy, Department of State.

ASSESSING THE TSA CHECKPOINT: THE PRECHECK PROGRAM AND AIRPORT WAIT TIMES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security held a hearing entitled “Assessing the TSA Checkpoint: The PreCheck Program and Airport Wait Times”. Testimony was heard from Darby LaJoye, Assistant Administrator, Office of Security Operations, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security; William Russell, Acting Director, Homeland Security and Justice Team, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2561, the “POLICE Act of 2017”. H.R. 2561 was ordered reported, as amended.

FEDERAL IMPEDIMENTS TO COMMERCE AND INNOVATIVE INJURIOUS SPECIES MANAGEMENT

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans held a hearing entitled “Federal Impediments to Commerce and Innovative Injurious Species Management”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Federal Lands held a hearing on H.R. 2365, the “Desert Community Lands Act”; H.R. 3777, the “Juab County Conveyance Act of 2017”; H.R. 4824, the “Rural Broadband Permitting Efficiency Act of 2018”; and H.R. 5023, the “Civil War Defenses of Washington National Historical Park Act”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Cook, Love,

Curtis, and Norton; Timothy Spisak, Acting Associate Director, Energy, Minerals, and Realty Management, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Lori Lamson, Assistant Town Manager, Apple Valley, California; Byron Woodland, County Commissioner, Juab County, Utah; and public witnesses.

A SUSTAINABLE SOLUTION TO THE EVOLVING OPIOID CRISIS: REVITALIZING THE OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “A Sustainable Solution to the Evolving Opioid Crisis: Revitalizing the Office of National Drug Control Policy”. Testimony was heard from Senator Cornyn; Rahul Gupta, Commissioner and State Health Officer, Bureau for Public Health, Department of Health and Human Resources, West Virginia; Gretta Goodwin, Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

AMERICA’S HUMAN PRESENCE IN LOW-EARTH ORBIT

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “America’s Human Presence in Low-Earth Orbit”. Testimony was heard from William Gerstenmaier, Associate Administrator, Human Exploration and Operations Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and public witnesses.

HOTLINE TRUTHS II: AUDIT REVEALS INCONSISTENCIES IN DEFENSE SUBCONTRACTING

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce held a hearing entitled “Hotline Truths II: Audit Reveals Inconsistencies in Defense Subcontracting”. Testimony was heard from Michael J. Roark, Assistant Inspector General, Readiness and Global Operations, Office of Inspector General, Department of Defense; Tommy L. Marks, Director, Army Office of Small Business Programs, Office of the Secretary of the Army; and a public witness.

VA RESEARCH: FOCUSING ON FUNDING, FINDINGS, AND PARTNERSHIPS

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Health; and Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a joint hearing entitled “VA Research: Focusing on Funding, Findings, and Partnerships”. Testimony was heard from Carolyn Clancy, M.D., Executive in Charge, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

A REVIEW OF VA’S VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AND EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing entitled “A Review of VA’s Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Program”. Testimony was heard from Jack Kammerer, Director, Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Service, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

SECURING AMERICANS’ IDENTITIES: THE FUTURE OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing entitled “Securing Americans’ Identities: The Future of the Social Security Number”. Testimony was heard from Nancy Berryhill, Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration; Elizabeth Curda, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

CHINA’S WORLDWIDE MILITARY EXPANSION

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “China’s Worldwide Military Expansion”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

OPPORTUNITY ZONES

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the promise of Opportunity Zones, after receiving testimony from Senator Scott; John Lettieri, Economic Innovation Group, Washington, D.C.; and Terri Ludwig, Enterprise Community Partners, and Maurice A. Jones, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, both of New York, New York.

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the structure and financial outlook of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, after receiving testimony from W. Thomas Reeder, Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY,
MAY 18, 2018**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment, hearing on H.R. 2278, the “Responsible Disposal Reauthorization Act of 2017”; and H.R. 2389, to

reauthorize the West Valley demonstration project and for other purposes, 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection, hearing entitled “Disrupter Series: Quantum Computing”, 9:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, hearing entitled “Accountability for OPEC: H.R. _____, the ‘No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act’”, 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, continue hearing entitled “Progress Report on the 2020 Census”, 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, May 21

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Dana Baiocco, of Ohio, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

(The filing deadline for first-degree amendments to the House Message to accompany S. 2372, Veterans Cemetery Benefit Correction Act, is at 5 p.m.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, May 18

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Complete consideration of H.R. 2—Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Beyer, Donald S., Jr., Va., E671
Blum, Rod, Iowa, E673
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E671, E676
Byrne, Bradley, Ala., E672
Capuano, Michael E., Mass., E669
Collins, Doug, Ga., E678, E678, E679
Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E672
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E678
Evans, Dwight, Pa., E678

Garamendi, John, Calif., E674, E675
Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E678
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E670
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E676
Jenkins, Evan H., W.Va., E671
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E679
Keating, William R., Mass., E675, E677
Kilmer, Derek, Wash., E669
Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E669
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E669
Norcross, Donald, N.J., E671

Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E669, E669, E670, E671, E671,
E672, E672, E673, E673, E674
Poe, Ted, Tex., E670, E672, E673, E675, E676, E677
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E674, E677
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E673, E674, E675, E677
Stewart, Chris, Utah, E673
Thompson, Glenn, Pa., E675
Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E675, E677
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E670
Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E674



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are