



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 2019

No. 109

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 27, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VERONICA ESCOBAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God, You created us endowed with freedom. We give You thanks for giving us another day.

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

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

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

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

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

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

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

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

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

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

The Treasury has had this design in the works for years, and now, all of a sudden, it is backpedaling. It takes 10 years, they say, to complete this work.

During a 10-year period, Harriet Tubman made 19 round trips on the underground railroad to lead over 300 slaves to freedom; and, in less time, Treasury can't put this American hero on a piece of paper.

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

☐ 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.

H5205

How long must it take to recognize an icon of freedom and courage?

How long must it take to rightfully acknowledge the work of a woman who helped countless enslaved Americans of African descent?

How long must it take when the American people overwhelmingly selected her as the face of the new \$20 bill?

Harriet Tubman embodies the American spirit of strength and hope.

It is time to put a woman on the \$20 bill. In this year, the 100th anniversary of women's suffrage, we want to guarantee that Treasury will follow through on this promise and this commitment.

#### RECOGNIZING DuBOIS AREA MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

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

The Schools to Watch recognition is based on a comprehensive 3-year review of the entire school. Only one other middle school in Pennsylvania has remained at the top with DuBois for their continuous designations.

The students, teachers, and faculty members have joined together to create a learning community where everyone is supported. Every year, the community is challenged to maintain their success by continuing to put their best foot forward. This week, they were recognized for their 12 years of excellence at the National Forum Schools to Watch Conference here in Washington, D.C.

I look forward meeting representatives from the DuBois Area Middle School later today. Madam Speaker, the entire 15th Congressional District of Pennsylvania is proud of their continuous success.

#### CRISIS AT THE BORDER

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, this is not my America. This is not the values of our America. Look at this picture.

Now, some critics think that this should not have been published, but I disagree, because these people are not rapists or murderers or drug dealers.

This is Oscar Ramirez and his 23-month-old daughter, Angie Valeria. They died on the Rio Grande River, Angie clinging to Oscar's neck and tucked under his shirt in a desperate attempt to survive.

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

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

We need to address this issue now.

#### RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT GENERAL ROBERT SCOTT WILLIAMS ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### RECOGNIZING AMERICAN GROWN FLOWERS MONTH

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of July as American Grown Flowers Month.

As co-chair of the House Cut Flowers Caucus, I know the buy local movement has encouraged customers to buy not only their food, but also their flowers, from local farmers. People want to support the small family farm down the road, whether it is lettuce or lilies.

The cut flower industry creates jobs, benefits our local economies, and naturally encourages us to embrace our planet's natural beauty.

For farmers, cut flowers allow us to preserve open spaces, participate in

sustainable agriculture, and, many times, support women-owned businesses.

In my home State of Maine, where I represent many small farms, more than 250 farms sell cut flowers, from the Snell Family Farm in Buxton to Lazy Acres Farm in Farmingdale.

This is an industry worth upwards of \$1 million to our economy and has seen such rapid growth in recent years that we have many flower CSAs for local customers. The new interest in locally sourced flowers has allowed farmers to diversify their crops and boost their income.

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

#### RECOGNIZING PARALYMPIC ATHLETE LIZZI SMITH

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an individual from Muncie, Indiana, who has made her community and State proud.

Lizzi Smith, a Paralympic athlete who competed in the 2016 Paralympic Games, is now working toward her goal of swimming in the 2020 Paralympic Games in Tokyo.

Lizzi has already accomplished so much in her swimming career. She helped Muncie Central High School win a sectional in high school. She won two world medals at the age of 17, and she came away from the 2016 Paralympics with two medals. Just this year, Lizzi set the Pan American record in the S10 100-meter butterfly.

I thank Lizzi for inspiring us to dream big and for setting a strong example for young Hoosiers and all Americans. I wish her the best of luck on the road to Tokyo.

Bring home the gold.

#### HIGHLIGHTING THE DAIRY MARGIN COVERAGE PROGRAM

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

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

My district in upstate New York is home to hundreds of dairy farmers, and way too many are struggling to survive with years of plummeting milk prices.

Now at the mercy of not just a complex pricing system, but also trade wars, our farmers need real support. I

encourage all dairy farmers in New York's 19th Congressional District to begin making coverage decisions.

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

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

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

□ 0915

**RECOGNIZING JUDY GENSHAFT**

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

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

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

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

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

Go Bulls.

**CARING FOR THE CHILDREN**

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

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

That spirit of welcoming and compassion is a part of what defines us as Americans. In fact, we have enshrined it in our legal code, including laws re-

quiring safe and sanitary conditions for migrant children. Yet right now, children are imprisoned in appalling and unconscionable conditions.

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

"Whatever you did unto the least of these, you did unto me."

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

**SECURING AMERICA'S FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT**

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 460, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-20, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-126, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2722

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Securing America's Federal Elections Act" or the "SAFE Act".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

**TITLE I—FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Subtitle A—Voting System Security Improvement Grants**

**PART 1—PROMOTING ACCURACY, INTEGRITY, AND SECURITY THROUGH VOTER-VERIFIED PERMANENT PAPER BALLOT**

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Paper ballot and manual counting requirements.

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

Sec. 104. Durability and readability requirements for ballots.

Sec. 105. Paper ballot printing requirements.

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

Sec. 107. Effective date for new requirements.

**PART 2—GRANTS TO CARRY OUT IMPROVEMENTS**

Sec. 111. Grants for obtaining compliant paper ballot voting systems and carrying out voting system security improvements.

Sec. 112. Coordination of voting system security activities with use of requirements payments and election administration requirements under Help America Vote Act of 2002.

Sec. 113. Incorporation of definitions.

**Subtitle B—Risk-Limiting Audits**

Sec. 121. Risk-limiting audits.

Sec. 122. Funding for conducting post-election risk-limiting audits.

Sec. 123. GAO analysis of effects of audits.

**TITLE II—PROMOTING CYBERSECURITY THROUGH IMPROVEMENTS IN ELECTION ADMINISTRATION**

Sec. 201. Voting system cybersecurity requirements.

Sec. 202. Testing of existing voting systems to ensure compliance with election cybersecurity guidelines and other guidelines.

Sec. 203. Requiring use of software and hardware for which information is disclosed by manufacturer.

Sec. 204. Treatment of electronic poll books as part of voting systems.

Sec. 205. Pre-election reports on voting system usage.

Sec. 206. Streamlining collection of election information.

**TITLE III—USE OF VOTING MACHINES MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES**

Sec. 301. Use of voting machines manufactured in the United States.

**TITLE IV—SEVERABILITY**

Sec. 401. Severability.

**TITLE I—FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Subtitle A—Voting System Security Improvement Grants**

**PART 1—PROMOTING ACCURACY, INTEGRITY, AND SECURITY THROUGH VOTER-VERIFIED PERMANENT PAPER BALLOT**

**SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.**

This subtitle may be cited as the "Voter Confidence and Increased Accessibility Act of 2019".

**SEC. 102. PAPER BALLOT AND MANUAL COUNTING REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 301(a)(2) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) PAPER BALLOT REQUIREMENT.—

"(A) VOTER-VERIFIED PAPER BALLOTS.—

"(i) PAPER BALLOT REQUIREMENT.—(I) The voting system shall require the use of an individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballot of the voter's vote that shall be marked and made available for inspection and verification by the voter before the voter's vote is cast and counted, and which shall be counted by hand or read by an optical character recognition device or other counting device. For purposes of this subclause, the term 'individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballot' means a paper ballot marked by the voter by hand or a paper ballot marked through the use of a nontabulating ballot marking device or system, so long as the voter shall have the option to mark his or her ballot by hand. The paper ballot shall be printed or marked in such a way that vote selections, including all vote selections scanned by voting systems to tabulate votes, can be inspected and verified by the voter without training or instruction or audited by election officials without the aid of any machine or other equipment.

"(II) The voting system shall provide the voter with an opportunity to correct any error on the paper ballot before the permanent voter-verified paper ballot is preserved in accordance with clause (ii).

"(III) The voting system shall not preserve the voter-verified paper ballots in any manner that makes it possible, at any time after the ballot has been cast, to associate a voter with the record of the voter's vote without the voter's consent.

“(ii) PRESERVATION AS OFFICIAL RECORD.—The individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballot used in accordance with clause (i) shall constitute the official ballot and shall be preserved and used as the official ballot for purposes of any recount or audit conducted with respect to any election for Federal office in which the voting system is used.

“(iii) MANUAL COUNTING REQUIREMENTS FOR RECOUNTS AND AUDITS.—(I) Each paper ballot used pursuant to clause (i) shall be suitable for a manual audit, and shall be counted by hand in any recount or audit conducted with respect to any election for Federal office.

“(II) In the event of any inconsistencies or irregularities between any electronic vote tallies and the vote tallies determined by counting by hand the individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots used pursuant to clause (i), and subject to subparagraph (B), the individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots shall be the true and correct record of the votes cast.

“(iv) APPLICATION TO ALL BALLOTS.—The requirements of this subparagraph shall apply to all ballots cast in elections for Federal office, including ballots cast by absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act and other absentee voters.

“(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR TREATMENT OF DISPUTES WHEN PAPER BALLOTS HAVE BEEN SHOWN TO BE COMPROMISED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the event that—  
“(I) there is any inconsistency between any electronic vote tallies and the vote tallies determined by counting by hand the individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots used pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i) with respect to any election for Federal office; and

“(II) it is demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence (as determined in accordance with the applicable standards in the jurisdiction involved) in any recount, audit, or contest of the result of the election that the paper ballots have been compromised (by damage or mischief or otherwise) and that a sufficient number of the ballots have been so compromised that the result of the election could be changed, the determination of the appropriate remedy with respect to the election shall be made in accordance with applicable State law, except that the electronic tally shall not be used as the exclusive basis for determining the official certified result.

“(ii) RULE FOR CONSIDERATION OF BALLOTS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH VOTING MACHINE.—For purposes of clause (i), only the paper ballots deemed compromised, if any, shall be considered in the calculation of whether or not the result of the election could be changed due to the compromised paper ballots.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT CLARIFYING APPLICABILITY OF ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE ACCESSIBILITY.—Section 301(a)(4) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(4)) is amended by inserting “(including the paper ballots required to be used under paragraph (2))” after “voting system”.

(c) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 301(a)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “counted” and inserting “counted, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3)”;

(2) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “counted” and inserting “counted, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3)”;

(3) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking “counted” each place it appears and inserting “counted, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3)”;

(4) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “counted” and inserting “counted, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3)”.

**SEC. 103. ACCESSIBILITY AND BALLOT VERIFICATION FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(a)(3)(B) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(3)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

“(B)(i) ensure that individuals with disabilities and others are given an equivalent opportunity to vote, including with privacy and independence, in a manner that produces a voter-verified paper ballot as for other voters;

“(ii) satisfy the requirement of subparagraph (A) through the use of at least one voting system equipped for individuals with disabilities, including nonvisual and enhanced visual accessibility for the blind and visually impaired, and nonmanual and enhanced manual accessibility for the mobility and dexterity impaired, at each polling place; and

“(iii) meet the requirements of subparagraph (A) and paragraph (2)(A) by using a system that—

“(I) allows the voter to privately and independently verify the permanent paper ballot through the presentation, in accessible form, of the printed or marked vote selections from the same printed or marked information that would be used for any vote counting or auditing; and

“(II) allows the voter to privately and independently verify and cast the permanent paper ballot without requiring the voter to manually handle the paper ballot;”

(b) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENT OF STUDY, TESTING, AND DEVELOPMENT OF ACCESSIBLE PAPER BALLOT VERIFICATION MECHANISMS.—

(1) STUDY AND REPORTING.—Subtitle C of title II of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 247 as section 248; and

(B) by inserting after section 246 the following new section:

**“SEC. 247. STUDY AND REPORT ON ACCESSIBLE PAPER BALLOT VERIFICATION MECHANISMS.**

“(a) STUDY AND REPORT.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall make grants to not fewer than 3 eligible entities to study, test, and develop accessible paper ballot voting, verification, and casting mechanisms and devices and best practices to enhance the accessibility of paper ballot voting and verification mechanisms for individuals with disabilities, for voters whose primary language is not English, and for voters with difficulties in literacy, including best practices for the mechanisms themselves and the processes through which the mechanisms are used.

“(b) ELIGIBILITY.—An entity is eligible to receive a grant under this part if it submits to the Director (at such time and in such form as the Director may require) an application containing—

“(1) certifications that the entity shall specifically investigate enhanced methods or devices, including non-electronic devices, that will assist such individuals and voters in marking voter-verified paper ballots and presenting or transmitting the information printed or marked on such ballots back to such individuals and voters, and casting such ballots;

“(2) a certification that the entity shall complete the activities carried out with the grant not later than December 31, 2020; and

“(3) such other information and certifications as the Director may require.

“(c) AVAILABILITY OF TECHNOLOGY.—Any technology developed with the grants made under this section shall be treated as non-proprietary and shall be made available to the public, including to manufacturers of voting systems.

“(d) COORDINATION WITH GRANTS FOR TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS.—The Director shall carry out this section so that the activities carried out with the grants made under subsection (a) are coordinated with the research conducted under the grant program carried out by the Commission under section 271, to the extent that the Director and Commission determine necessary to provide for the advancement of accessible voting technology.

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry

out subsection (a) \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended—

(A) by redesignating the item relating to section 247 as relating to section 248; and

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 246 the following new item:

“Sec. 247. Study and report on accessible paper ballot verification mechanisms.”

(c) CLARIFICATION OF ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS UNDER VOLUNTARY VOTING SYSTEM GUIDANCE.—In adopting any voluntary guidance under subtitle B of title III of the Help America Vote Act with respect to the accessibility of the paper ballot verification requirements for individuals with disabilities, the Election Assistance Commission shall include and apply the same accessibility standards applicable under the voluntary guidance adopted for accessible voting systems under such subtitle.

(d) PERMITTING USE OF FUNDS FOR PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY SYSTEMS TO SUPPORT ACTIONS TO ENFORCE ELECTION-RELATED DISABILITY ACCESS.—Section 292(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21062(a)) is amended by striking “; except that” and all that follows and inserting a period.

**SEC. 104. DURABILITY AND READABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS.**

Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) DURABILITY AND READABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS.—

“(A) DURABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PAPER BALLOTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—All voter-verified paper ballots required to be used under this Act shall be marked or printed on durable paper.

“(ii) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this Act, paper is ‘durable’ if it is capable of withstanding multiple counts and recounts by hand without compromising the fundamental integrity of the ballots, and capable of retaining the information marked or printed on them for the full duration of a retention and preservation period of 22 months.

“(B) READABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PAPER BALLOTS MARKED BY BALLOT MARKING DEVICE.—All voter-verified paper ballots completed by the voter through the use of a ballot marking device shall be clearly readable by the voter without assistance (other than eyeglasses or other personal vision enhancing devices) and by an optical character recognition device or other device equipped for individuals with disabilities.”

**SEC. 105. PAPER BALLOT PRINTING REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) REQUIRING PAPER BALLOTS TO BE PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER MANUFACTURED IN UNITED STATES.—Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 104, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) PRINTING REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS.—All paper ballots used in an election for Federal office shall be printed in the United States on recycled paper manufactured in the United States.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to elections occurring on or after January 1, 2021.

**SEC. 106. STUDY AND REPORT ON OPTIMAL BALLOT DESIGN.**

(a) STUDY.—The Election Assistance Commission shall conduct a study of the best ways to design ballots used in elections for public office, including paper ballots and electronic or digital ballots, to minimize confusion and user errors.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2020, the Election Assistance Commission shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a).

**SEC. 107. EFFECTIVE DATE FOR NEW REQUIREMENTS.**

Section 301(d) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this section on and after January 1, 2006.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

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

“(B) DELAY FOR JURISDICTIONS USING CERTAIN PAPER RECORD PRINTERS OR CERTAIN SYSTEMS USING OR PRODUCING VOTER-VERIFIED PAPER RECORDS IN 2018.—

“(i) DELAY.—In the case of a jurisdiction described in clause (ii), subparagraph (A) shall apply to a voting system in the jurisdiction as if the reference in such subparagraph to ‘2020’ were a reference to ‘2022’, but only with respect to the following requirements of this section:

“(I) Paragraph (2)(A)(i)(I) of subsection (a) (relating to the use of voter-verified paper ballots).

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

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

“(ii) JURISDICTIONS DESCRIBED.—A jurisdiction described in this clause is a jurisdiction—

“(I) which used voter-verified paper record printers attached to direct recording electronic voting machines, or which used other voting systems that used or produced paper records of the vote verifiable by voters but that are not in compliance with paragraphs (2)(A)(i)(I), (3)(B)(iii)(I) and (II), and (7) of subsection (a) (as amended or added by the Voter Confidence and Increased Accessibility Act of 2019), for the administration of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2018; and

“(II) which will continue to use such printers or systems for the administration of elections for Federal office held in years before 2022.

“(iii) MANDATORY AVAILABILITY OF PAPER BALLOTS AT POLLING PLACES USING GRANDFATHERED PRINTERS AND SYSTEMS.—

“(I) REQUIRING BALLOTS TO BE OFFERED AND PROVIDED.—The appropriate election official at each polling place that uses a printer or system described in clause (ii)(I) for the administration of elections for Federal office shall offer each individual who is eligible to cast a vote in the election at the polling place the opportunity to cast the vote using a blank pre-printed paper ballot which the individual may mark by hand and which is not produced by the direct recording electronic voting machine or other such system. The official shall provide the individual with the ballot and the supplies necessary to mark the ballot, and shall ensure (to the greatest extent practicable) that the waiting period for the individual to cast a vote is the lesser of 30 minutes or the average waiting period for an individual who does not agree to cast the vote using such a paper ballot under this clause.

“(II) TREATMENT OF BALLOT.—Any paper ballot which is cast by an individual under this clause shall be counted and otherwise treated as a regular ballot for all purposes (including by incorporating it into the final unofficial vote count (as defined by the State) for the precinct) and not as a provisional ballot, unless the individual casting the ballot would have otherwise been required to cast a provisional ballot.

“(III) POSTING OF NOTICE.—The appropriate election official shall ensure there is prominently displayed at each polling place a notice that describes the obligation of the official to

offer individuals the opportunity to cast votes using a pre-printed blank paper ballot.

“(IV) TRAINING OF ELECTION OFFICIALS.—The chief State election official shall ensure that election officials at polling places in the State are aware of the requirements of this clause, including the requirement to display a notice under subclause (III), and are aware that it is a violation of the requirements of this title for an election official to fail to offer an individual the opportunity to cast a vote using a blank pre-printed paper ballot.

“(V) PERIOD OF APPLICABILITY.—The requirements of this clause apply only during the period in which the delay is in effect under clause (i).

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

## PART 2—GRANTS TO CARRY OUT IMPROVEMENTS

### SEC. 111. GRANTS FOR OBTAINING COMPLIANT PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AND CARRYING OUT VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.

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

#### “PART 7—GRANTS FOR OBTAINING COMPLIANT PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AND CARRYING OUT VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

##### “SEC. 297. GRANTS FOR OBTAINING COMPLIANT PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AND CARRYING OUT VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.

“(a) AVAILABILITY AND USE OF GRANT.—The Commission shall make a grant to each eligible State—

“(1) to replace a voting system—

“(A) which does not meet the requirements which are first imposed on the State pursuant to the amendments made by the Voter Confidence and Increased Accessibility Act of 2019 with a voting system which does meet such requirements, for use in the regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in November 2020, or

“(B) which does meet such requirements but which is not in compliance with the most recent voluntary voting system guidelines issued by the Commission prior to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2020 with another system which does meet such requirements and is in compliance with such guidelines;

“(2) to carry out voting system security improvements described in section 297A with respect to the regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in November 2020 and each succeeding election for Federal office; and

“(3) to implement and model best practices for ballot design, ballot instructions, and the testing of ballots.

“(b) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—The amount of a grant made to a State under this section shall be such amount as the Commission determines to be appropriate, except that such amount may not be less than the product of \$1 and the average of the number of individuals who cast votes in any of the two most recent regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in the State.

“(c) PRO RATA REDUCTIONS.—If the amount of funds appropriated for grants under this part is

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

“(d) SURPLUS APPROPRIATIONS.—If the amount of funds appropriated for grants authorized under section 297D(a)(2) exceed the amount necessary to meet the requirements of subsection (b), the Commission shall consider the following in making a determination to award remaining funds to a State:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(2) Evidence of established conditions of innovation and reform in providing voting system security and the proposed plan of the State for implementing additional conditions.

“(3) Evidence of collaboration between relevant stakeholders, including local election officials, in developing the grant implementation plan described in section 297B.

“(4) The plan of the State to conduct a rigorous evaluation of the effectiveness of the activities carried out with the grant.

“(e) ABILITY OF REPLACEMENT SYSTEMS TO ADMINISTER RANKED CHOICE ELECTIONS.—To the greatest extent practicable, an eligible State which receives a grant to replace a voting system under this section shall ensure that the replacement system is capable of administering a system of ranked choice voting under which each voter shall rank the candidates for the office in the order of the voter’s preference.

#### “SEC. 297A. VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS DESCRIBED.

“(a) PERMITTED USES.—A voting system security improvement described in this section is any of the following:

“(1) The acquisition of goods and services from qualified election infrastructure vendors by purchase, lease, or such other arrangements as may be appropriate.

“(2) Cyber and risk mitigation training.

“(3) A security risk and vulnerability assessment of the State’s election infrastructure which is carried out by a provider of cybersecurity services under a contract entered into between the chief State election official and the provider.

“(4) The maintenance of election infrastructure, including addressing risks and vulnerabilities which are identified under either of the security risk and vulnerability assessments described in paragraph (3), except that none of the funds provided under this part may be used to renovate or replace a building or facility which is used primarily for purposes other than the administration of elections for public office.

“(5) Providing increased technical support for any information technology infrastructure that the chief State election official deems to be part

of the State's election infrastructure or designates as critical to the operation of the State's election infrastructure.

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

“(7) Enhancing the cybersecurity of voter registration systems.

“(b) QUALIFIED ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE VENDORS DESCRIBED.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(3) CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A vendor meets the requirements of this paragraph if, upon becoming aware of the possibility that an election cybersecurity incident has occurred involving any of the goods and services provided by the vendor pursuant to a grant under this part—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(iv) The circumstances of the election cybersecurity incident, including the specific election infrastructure systems believed to have been accessed and information acquired, if any.

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

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

“SEC. 297B. ELIGIBILITY OF STATES.

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

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

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

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

“SEC. 297C. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

“Not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Commission shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, including the Committees on Homeland Security, House Administration, and the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Judiciary, and Rules and Administration of the Senate, on the activities carried out with the funds provided under this part.

“SEC. 297D. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

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

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

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

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

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

“PART 7—GRANTS FOR OBTAINING COMPLIANT PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AND CARRYING OUT VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

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

“Sec. 297A. Voting system security improvements described.

“Sec. 297B. Eligibility of States.

“Sec. 297C. Reports to Congress.

“Sec. 297D. Authorization of appropriations.

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

(a) DUTIES OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—Section 202 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20922) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “by” and inserting “and the security of election infrastructure by”.

(b) MEMBERSHIP OF SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY ON BOARD OF ADVISORS OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—Section 214(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20944(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “37 members” and inserting “38 members”; and

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

“(17) The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary's designee.”.

(c) REPRESENTATIVE OF DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY ON TECHNICAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.—Section 221(c)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20961(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

“(E) A representative of the Department of Homeland Security.”.

(d) GOALS OF PERIODIC STUDIES OF ELECTION ADMINISTRATION ISSUES; CONSULTATION WITH SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—Section 241(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20981(a)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the Commission shall” and inserting “the Commission, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security (as appropriate), shall”;

(2) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (3);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) will be secure against attempts to undermine the integrity of election systems by cyber or other means; and”.

(e) REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS.—

(1) USE OF PAYMENTS FOR VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 251(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21001(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) PERMITTING USE OF PAYMENTS FOR VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.—A State may use a requirements payment to carry out any of the following activities:

“(A) Cyber and risk mitigation training.

“(B) Providing increased technical support for any information technology infrastructure that the chief State election official deems to be part of the State's election infrastructure or designates as critical to the operation of the State's election infrastructure.

“(C) Enhancing the cybersecurity and operations of the information technology infrastructure described in subparagraph (B).

“(D) Enhancing the security of voter registration databases.”.

(2) INCORPORATION OF ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION IN STATE PLANS FOR USE OF PAYMENTS.—Section 254(a)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21004(a)(1)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “, including the protection of election infrastructure.”.

(3) COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEE RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPING STATE PLAN FOR USE OF PAYMENTS.—Section 255 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21005) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) GEOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION.—The members of the committee shall be a representative group of individuals from the State's counties, cities, towns, and Indian tribes, and shall represent the needs of rural as well as urban areas of the State, as the case may be.”.

(f) ENSURING PROTECTION OF COMPUTERIZED STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION LIST.—Section 303(a)(3) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21083(a)(3)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “, as well as other measures to prevent and deter cybersecurity incidents, as identified by the Commission, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Technical Guidelines Development Committee.”.

SEC. 113. INCORPORATION OF DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21141) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 901. DEFINITIONS.**

“In this Act, the following definitions apply:  
“(1) The term ‘cybersecurity incident’ has the meaning given the term ‘incident’ in section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 659).

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

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

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

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

“Sec. 901. Definitions.”

**Subtitle B—Risk-Limiting Audits****SEC. 121. RISK-LIMITING AUDITS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

**“SEC. 303A. RISK-LIMITING AUDITS.**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) RISK-LIMITING AUDIT.—The term ‘risk-limiting audit’ means, with respect to any election contest, a post-election process that—

“(A) has a probability of at least 95 percent of correcting the reported outcome if the reported outcome is not the correct outcome;

“(B) will not change the outcome if the reported outcome is the correct outcome; and

“(C) involves a manual adjudication of voter intent from some or all of the ballots validly cast in the election contest.

“(2) REPORTED OUTCOME; CORRECT OUTCOME; OUTCOME.—

“(A) REPORTED OUTCOME.—The term ‘reported outcome’ means the outcome of an election contest which is determined according to the canvass and which will become the official, certified outcome unless it is revised by an audit, recount, or other legal process.

“(B) CORRECT OUTCOME.—The term ‘correct outcome’ means the outcome that would be determined by a manual adjudication of voter intent for all votes validly cast in the election contest.

“(C) OUTCOME.—The term ‘outcome’ means the winner or set of winners of an election contest.

“(3) MANUAL ADJUDICATION OF VOTER INTENT.—The term ‘manual adjudication of voter intent’ means direct inspection and determination by humans, without assistance from electronic or mechanical tabulation devices, of the ballot choices marked by voters on each voter-verified paper record.

“(4) BALLOT MANIFEST.—The term ‘ballot manifest’ means a record maintained by each jurisdiction that—

“(A) is created without reliance on any part of the voting system used to tabulate votes;

“(B) functions as a sampling frame for conducting a risk-limiting audit; and

“(C) accounts for all ballots validly cast regardless of how they were tabulated and includes a precise description of the manner in which the ballots are physically stored, including the total number of physical groups of ballots, the numbering system for each group, a unique label for each group, and the number of ballots in each such group.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) AUDITS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each State and jurisdiction shall administer risk-limiting audits of the results of all election contests for Federal office held in the State in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (2).

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—Clause (i) shall not apply to any election contest for which the State or jurisdiction conducts a full recount through a manual adjudication of voter intent.

“(B) FULL MANUAL TABULATION.—If a risk-limiting audit conducted under subparagraph (A) corrects the reported outcome of an election contest, the State or jurisdiction shall use the results of the manual adjudication of voter intent conducted as part of the risk-limiting audit as the official results of the election contest.

“(2) AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) RULES AND PROCEDURES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the chief State election official of the State shall establish rules and procedures for conducting risk-limiting audits.

“(ii) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The rules and procedures established under clause (i) shall include the following:

“(I) Rules and procedures for ensuring the security of ballots and documenting that prescribed procedures were followed.

“(II) Rules and procedures for ensuring the accuracy of ballot manifests produced by jurisdictions.

“(III) Rules and procedures for governing the format of ballot manifests and other data involved in risk-limiting audits.

“(IV) Methods to ensure that any cast vote records used in a risk-limiting audit are those used by the voting system to tally the results of the election contest sent to the chief State election official of the State and made public.

“(V) Rules and procedures for the random selection of ballots to be inspected manually during each audit.

“(VI) Rules and procedures for the calculations and other methods to be used in the audit and to determine whether and when the audit of each election contest is complete.

“(VII) Rules and procedures for testing any software used to conduct risk-limiting audits.

“(B) PUBLIC REPORT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—After the completion of the risk-limiting audit and at least 5 days before the election contest is certified, the State shall publish a report on the results of the audit, together with such information as necessary to confirm that the audit was conducted properly.

“(ii) FORMAT OF DATA.—All data published with the report under clause (i) shall be published in machine-readable, open data formats.

“(iii) PROTECTION OF ANONYMITY OF VOTES.—Information and data published by the State under this subparagraph shall not compromise the anonymity of votes.

“(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this section for the first regularly scheduled election for Federal office held more than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Securing America’s Federal Elections Act and for each subsequent election for Federal office.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO ENFORCEMENT.—Section 401 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21111) is amended by striking “sections 301, 302, and 303” and inserting “subtitle A of title III”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after

the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

“Sec. 303A. Risk-limiting audits.”

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

(a) PAYMENTS TO STATES.—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21001 et seq.), as amended by section 111(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

**“PART 8—FUNDING FOR POST-ELECTION RISK-LIMITING AUDITS****“SEC. 298. PAYMENTS FOR POST-ELECTION RISK-LIMITING AUDITS.**

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

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

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

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

“(c) SPECIAL RULES.—

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

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

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

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

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as are necessary to carry out this part.

“(2) AVAILABILITY.—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain available without fiscal year limitation until expended.”

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

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

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

**SEC. 123. GAO ANALYSIS OF EFFECTS OF AUDITS.**

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

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report on the analysis conducted under subsection (a) to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

**TITLE II—PROMOTING CYBERSECURITY THROUGH IMPROVEMENTS IN ELECTION ADMINISTRATION**

**SEC. 201. VOTING SYSTEM CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) **BALLOT TABULATING DEVICES.**—Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 104 and section 105, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) **BALLOT TABULATING METHODS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The voting system tabulates ballots by hand or through the use of an optical scanning device that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

“(B) **REQUIREMENTS FOR OPTICAL SCANNING DEVICES.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the requirements of this subparagraph are as follows:

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

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

“(iii) The device consists of hardware that demonstrably conforms to a hardware component manifest describing point-of-origin information (including upstream hardware supply chain information for each component) that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(C) **WAIVER.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, may waive one or more of the requirements of subparagraph (B) (other than the requirement of clause (i) thereof) with respect to any device for a period of not to exceed 2 years.

“(ii) **PUBLICATION.**—Information relating to any waiver granted under clause (i) shall be made publicly available on the Internet.

“(D) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this paragraph for the regularly scheduled election for Federal office in November 2024, and for each subsequent election for Federal office.”.

(b) **OTHER CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 301(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 104, section 105, and subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

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

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—No system or device upon which ballot marking devices or optical scanners are configured, upon which ballots are marked by voters (except as necessary for individuals with disabilities to use ballot marking devices that meet the accessibility requirements of paragraph (3)), or upon which votes are cast, tabulated, or aggregated shall contain, use, or be accessible by any wireless, power-line, or concealed communication device.

“(B) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this paragraph for the regularly scheduled election for Federal office in November 2020, and for each subsequent election for Federal office.

“(11) **PROHIBITING CONNECTION OF SYSTEM TO THE INTERNET.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—No system or device upon which ballot marking devices or optical scanners are configured, upon which ballots are marked by voters, or upon which votes are cast, tabulated, or aggregated shall be connected to the Internet or any non-local computer system via telephone or other communication network at any time.

“(B) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this paragraph for the regularly scheduled election for Federal office in November 2020, and for each subsequent election for Federal office.”.

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

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 301(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 104, section 105, and subsections (a) and (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(12) **BALLOT MARKING DEVICES.**—

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

“(i) is not capable of tabulating votes;

“(ii) except in the case of a ballot marking device used exclusively to comply with the requirements of paragraph (3), is certified in accordance with section 232 as meeting the requirements of subparagraph (B); and

“(iii) meets the requirements of clauses (iii) through (viii) of section 301(a)(9)(B).

“(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

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

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

“(I) a pool of subjects that are—

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

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

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

“(C) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this paragraph for the regularly scheduled election for Federal office in November 2022, and for each subsequent election for Federal office.”.

(2) **PROCEDURE FOR TESTING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle B of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20971 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“**SEC. 232. TESTING AND CERTIFICATION OF BALLOT MARKING DEVICES.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any State or jurisdiction which intends to use a ballot marking device (other than a ballot marking device used exclusively to comply with the requirements of section 301(a)(3)) in an election for Federal office may submit an application to the Commission for testing and certification under this section.

“(b) **APPLICATION, ASSIGNMENT, AND TESTING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An application under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 18 months before the date of the election for Federal office in which the ballot marking device is intended to be used and shall contain such information as the Commission requires.

“(2) **ASSIGNMENT.**—Upon receipt of an application for testing under this section, the Commission shall contract with a qualified independent user experience research laboratory for the testing of whether the ballot marking device intended to be used by the State or jurisdiction meets the requirements of section 301(a)(12)(B).

“(3) **REQUIREMENTS FOR TESTING.**—Any contract described in paragraph (2) shall require the qualified independent user experience research laboratory to—

“(A) not later than 30 days before testing begins, submit to the Commission for approval the protocol for the simulated election scenario used for testing the ballot marking device;

“(B) use only protocols approved by the Commission in conducting such testing; and

“(C) submit to the Commission a report on the results of the testing.

“(4) **QUALIFIED INDEPENDENT USER EXPERIENCE RESEARCH LABORATORY.**—For purposes of this section:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘qualified independent user experience research laboratory’ means a laboratory accredited under this subsection by the Election Assistance Commission in accordance with standards determined by the Commission, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(B) **CRITERIA.**—A laboratory shall not be accredited under this subsection unless such laboratory demonstrates that—

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

“(ii) any group of individuals conducting tests under this section collectively meet the following qualifications:

“(I) Experience designing and running user research studies and experiments using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

“(II) Experience with voting systems.

“(C) **REVIEW BY INDEPENDENT BOARD.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall submit for approval to an independent review board established under paragraph (3) the following:

“(A) Any protocol submitted to the Commission under subsection (b)(3)(A).

“(B) Any report submitted to the Commission under subsection (b)(3)(C).

“(2) **FINAL APPROVAL.**—Not later than the date that is 12 months before the date of the election for Federal office in which a State or jurisdiction intends to use the ballot marking device, the independent review board shall report to the Commission on whether it has approved a report submitted under paragraph (1)(B).

“(3) **INDEPENDENT REVIEW BOARD.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An independent review board established under this paragraph shall be composed of 5 independent scientists appointed by the Commission, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.



“(B) QUALIFICATIONS.—The members of the independent review board—

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

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

“(4) PUBLICATION.—The Commission shall make public—

“(A) any protocol approved under this subsection;

“(B) any report submitted under subsection (b)(3)(C); and

“(C) any determination made by an independent review board under paragraph (2).

“(d) CERTIFICATION.—If—

“(1) a ballot marking device is determined by the qualified independent user experience research laboratory to meet the requirements of section 301(a)(12); and

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

then the Commission shall certify the ballot marking device.

“(e) PROHIBITION ON FEES.—The Commission may not charge any fee to a State or jurisdiction, a developer or manufacturer of a ballot marking device, or any other person in connection with testing and certification under this section.”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Section 202(2) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20922(2)) is amended by inserting “and ballot marking devices” after “hardware and software”.

(ii) The heading for subtitle B of title II of such Act is amended by inserting at the end “; **Ballot Marking Devices**”.

(iii) The table of contents of such Act is amended—

(I) by inserting “; **Ballot Marking Devices**” at the end of the item relating to subtitle B of title II; and

(II) by inserting after the item related to section 231 the following:

“Sec. 232. Testing and certification of ballot marking devices.”.

**SEC. 202. TESTING OF EXISTING VOTING SYSTEMS TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH ELECTION CYBERSECURITY GUIDELINES AND OTHER GUIDELINES.**

(a) REQUIRING TESTING OF EXISTING VOTING SYSTEMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 231(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20971(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) TESTING TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH GUIDELINES.—

“(A) TESTING.—Not later than 9 months before the date of each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the Commission shall provide for the testing by accredited laboratories under this section of the voting system hardware and software which was certified for use in the most recent such election, on the basis of the most recent voting system guidelines applicable to such hardware or software (including election cybersecurity guidelines) issued under this Act.

“(B) DECERTIFICATION OF HARDWARE OR SOFTWARE FAILING TO MEET GUIDELINES.—If, on the basis of the testing described in subparagraph (A), the Commission determines that any voting system hardware or software does not meet the most recent guidelines applicable to such hardware or software issued under this Act, the Commission shall decertify such hardware or software.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal

office held in November 2020 and each succeeding regularly scheduled general election for Federal office.

(b) ISSUANCE OF CYBERSECURITY GUIDELINES BY TECHNICAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.—Section 221(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20961(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) ELECTION CYBERSECURITY GUIDELINES.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of the Securing America’s Federal Elections Act, the Development Committee shall issue election cybersecurity guidelines, including standards and best practices for procuring, maintaining, testing, operating, and updating election systems to prevent and deter cybersecurity incidents.”.

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

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

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

“(A) REQUIRING USE OF SOFTWARE FOR WHICH SOURCE CODE IS DISCLOSED BY MANUFACTURER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the operation of voting systems in an election for Federal office, a State may only use software for which the manufacturer makes the source code (in the form in which will be used at the time of the election) publicly available online under a license that grants a worldwide, royalty-free, non-exclusive, perpetual, sub-licensable license to all intellectual property rights in such source code, except that the manufacturer may prohibit a person who obtains the software from using the software in a manner that is primarily intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation that is unrelated to carrying out legitimate research or cybersecurity activity.

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Clause (i) does not apply with respect to—

“(I) widely-used operating system software which is not specific to voting systems and for which the source code or baseline functionality is not altered; or

“(II) widely-used cybersecurity software which is not specific to voting systems and for which the source code or baseline functionality is not altered.

“(B) REQUIRING USE OF HARDWARE FOR WHICH INFORMATION IS DISCLOSED BY MANUFACTURER.—

“(i) REQUIRING DISCLOSURE OF HARDWARE.—A State may not use a voting system in an election for Federal office unless the manufacturer of the system publicly discloses online the identification of the hardware used to operate the system.

“(ii) ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR CUSTOM OR ALTERED HARDWARE.—To the extent that the hardware used to operate a voting system or any component thereof is not widely-used, or is widely-used but is altered, the State may not use the system in an election for Federal office unless—

“(I) the manufacturer of the system publicly discloses online the components of the hardware, the design of such components, and how such components are connected in the operation of the system; and

“(II) the manufacturer makes the design (in the form which will be used at the time of the election) publicly available online under a license that grants a worldwide, royalty-free, non-exclusive, perpetual, sub-licensable license to all intellectual property rights in the design of the hardware or the component, except that the manufacturer may prohibit a person who obtains the design from using the design in a manner that is primarily intended for or di-

rected toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation that is unrelated to carrying out legitimate research or cybersecurity activity.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

**SEC. 204. TREATMENT OF ELECTRONIC POLL BOOKS AS PART OF VOTING SYSTEMS.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(1) to retain the list of registered voters at a polling location, or vote center, or other location at which voters cast votes in an election for Federal office; and

“(2) to identify registered voters who are eligible to vote in an election.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 301(e) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081(e)), as amended by section 107 and as redesignated by subsection (b), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3)”; and

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

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

**SEC. 205. PRE-ELECTION REPORTS ON VOTING SYSTEM USAGE.**

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

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

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

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

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

“Sec. 301A. Pre-election reports on voting system usage.”.

**SEC. 206. STREAMLINING COLLECTION OF ELECTION INFORMATION.**

Section 202 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20922) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Commission” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission”; and

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

“(b) WAIVER OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—Subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to the collection of information for purposes of maintaining the clearinghouse described in paragraph (1) of subsection (a).”

**TITLE III—USE OF VOTING MACHINES MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES****SEC. 301. USE OF VOTING MACHINES MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES.**

Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 104, section 105, section 201(a), 201(b), 201(c), and section 203(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(14) VOTING MACHINE REQUIREMENTS.—By not later than the date of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office occurring in November 2022, each State shall seek to ensure that any voting machine used in such election and in any subsequent election for Federal office is manufactured in the United States.”

**TITLE IV—SEVERABILITY****SEC. 401. SEVERABILITY.**

If any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 2722.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2722. The SAFE Act is critical legislation to invest in and upgrade the machinery of American democracy. It will help us combat the national emergency facing our country. It will improve the resilience of election infrastructure used in Federal elections.

Aging equipment, under-resourced jurisdictions, and interference by foreign entities or non-state actors leaves the system vulnerable to exploitation that can undermine confidence in election

outcomes. Ineffective and vulnerable equipment can also discourage participation in Federal elections.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In June of 2016 the Russian GRU compromised the computer network of the Illinois State Board of Elections by exploiting a vulnerability in their

website. They gained access to a database with information on millions of Illinois voters and extracted data on thousands before the activity was detected.

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

The bill’s section 102 requires that States transition to voting systems that use individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots, which means a paper ballot marked by the voter by hand or through the use of a non-tabulating ballot marking device or system. Voter-verified paper ballots are the best way to ensure that a voter’s ballot accurately reflects their choices and is counted as cast. Paper can be audited. In the last Presidential election, approximately 20 percent of registered voters cast their ballot on voting machines that do not have any kind of paper backup.

The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine concluded that paperless systems “should be removed from service as soon as possible.”

In at least 40 States, elections are carried out using machines that are at least a decade old. And like any technology, they are susceptible to increasing failure with age. One witness at our election security hearing, Lawrence Norden of the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU Law School, explained that some State officials have “had to turn to eBay to find critical components like dot-matrix printer ribbons, decades old storage devices, and analog modems.” Aging systems also frequently rely on unsupported software like Windows XP and 2000, which may not receive regular security patches and are thus more vulnerable to the latest methods of cyberattack.

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

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

Originally, the bill, as introduced, would have authorized \$1 billion for this initial round of surge funding; however, during the Committee on House Administration’s markup, the committee approved an amendment in the nature of a substitute that authorized \$600 million instead. Combined with the \$380 million that Congress appropriated last year in election security grants, this funding reaches the \$1 billion that experts have said is necessary to implement these necessary protections.

The bill also provides in section 111 \$175 million in biennial maintenance funding. Cybersecurity threats will not dissipate, they will only evolve. State election officials have told us repeatedly they need more funding and a sustainable source of funding.

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

The bill fosters accountability for election technology vendors. It would create a qualified election infrastructure vendor designation where the Election Assistance Commission, in coordination with the Department of Homeland Security, would craft criteria that vendors would follow to receive the qualified designation. This would include reporting any known or suspected cybersecurity incidents involving election infrastructure to both the EAC and DHS, as well as affected election agencies.

The bill in sections 201 and 203 also includes open-source provisions, requiring use of software and hardware for which information is disclosed by manufacturers. This will allow cybersecurity experts and the public to vet the security of election systems regardless of the technology used.

As amended in the committee, the bill in section 121 requires States to adopt risk-limiting audits. Risk-limiting audits are the gold standard of post-election audits. They involve hand counting a certain number of ballots using advanced statistical methods to determine with a high degree of confidence that the reported election outcome is accurate. The SAFE Act requires States to implement risk-limiting audits because they go hand in hand with paper ballots. We need audits to ensure that ballot marking devices or optical scanners were not hacked and that the reported results are accurate.

Second, as amended in committee, the bill in section 201 includes specific cybersecurity standards to apply to optical scanner voting systems and another set of standards to apply to ballot marking devices. These will apply equally to current and future technology. For example, H.R. 2722 prohibits the use of wireless communications devices and internet connectivity in voting systems upon which ballots are marked by voters or that otherwise mark and tabulate ballots.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2722 is an essential step forward in shoring up our election infrastructure and investing in secure elections. I ask the House to pass this legislation and bolster the trust and confidence in our system that all Americans expect and deserve.

Every American—no matter what their choice in politics—should know that their vote will be counted as cast.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 0930

This allowed the Department of Homeland Security to begin providing additional cybersecurity assistance to State and local election officials.

Work has been done to help States improve their election security, and more work must be done. This is why our committee Republicans, all of us on the House Administration Committee, introduced H.R. 3412, the Election Security Assistance Act, to assist States in their election security strengthening efforts.

This realistic legislation provides \$380 million in Federal grants to States to update their aging and at-risk election infrastructure, while also requiring State and local officials to have some skin in the game. We require a 25 percent match to ensure that they understand they are getting the best equipment that is going to protect their voters' rights to have their votes counted and protected.

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

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

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

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

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

State officials should know if there is a threat to their election system, and DHS should be the one telling them.

To sum up the Election Security Assistance Act, our solution provides much-needed election security improvements and reinforcements for local election officials, without overstepping the States' authority to determine and maintain their own elections.

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

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

As we all know, questionable results in just one county can derail an entire Presidential election and throw our country into a tailspin.

Election security is national security. Election machinery is the machinery of democracy.

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

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

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to

the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Congress should focus on legislation that provides much-needed improvements and reinforcements for local officials without overstepping the States' authority to maintain their elections.

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

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

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

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

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

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

What does it mean by "republican form of government"? It doesn't mean a Republican Party form of government. It means a representative form of government. That means we must have a system that accurately translates the popular will into the election of a Congress.

This is a massive technical challenge in a country of hundreds of millions of people, 50 States, and thousands of jurisdictions, especially in the computer age. We need voter-certified, paper-ballot voting systems in every State in the Union. We need risk-reducing audits. We need real accountability for election vendors. We need voting machines manufactured in the United States, where our democracy is created, too.

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

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

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

I rise today as a Member from the great State of Florida. We all recall the 2000 Presidential election. What happened in Palm Beach County turned into a national punch line, "the hanging chad."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ), another good friend of mine from the great State of Florida.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Among the many disturbing revelations in the Mueller report, we learned that Russian intelligence officers successfully infiltrated the computer network in my home State at the Illinois

State Board of Elections. They accessed the personal information of millions of voters and stole thousands of voter records before being detected.

As far as we know, this breach has not affected the results of any subsequent elections, but it desperately underscores the need for much greater election security moving forward.

Now, officials in my home State and others around the country have worked tirelessly to secure these vulnerabilities over the past 3 years, but without the help of the Federal Government, they can only do so much. It is past time that we step up and give States the resources they need to ensure our elections and our voters are safe in the upcoming election.

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

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

□ 0945

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In California, paid campaign staff can collect hundreds of ballots without having to disclose who they are working for. When they hand over those ballots to election officials, there is no requirement to even provide their name.

Some of my friends across the aisle claim that the real problem is bad actors committing fraud. But it is the very practice of ballot harvesting being the problem. The reality is this process is an open invitation for fraud. That is why most States have banned the practice.

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

Madam Speaker, American voters deserve better. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill until we can get serious about real threats to our democracy.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Look, even in our own hearing, the chief technologist at the Center for Democracy and Technology agreed when I brought this scenario forward, that we use the technology of DREs that then will print a verifiable ballot or a receipt. He said that those were absolutely safe.

Now, here is the problem. When we go to paper ballots, and everyone is going to fill out these paper ballots, we are talking long lines. We are talking about fewer people being able to get to the polls.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I want to make sure for minorities, every vote counts, and for every American, every vote counts.

I want to end voter suppression. The way we do this is to have safe elections.

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

I ask my friends to support this legislation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, another salutary feature of the SAFE Act is that it requires accountability for election technology vendors and sets cy-

bersecurity standards and prohibits wireless and internet connectivity on systems that count ballots or upon which voters mark their ballots or systems are configured.

The SAFE Act also limits state expenditures on goods and services with grant monies provided under this Act to purchases from "qualified election infrastructure vendors."

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

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

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

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

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

And to add shame to insult and injury, at a meeting in Helsinki, Finland, rather than embracing the conclusions of the U.S. Intelligence Community, the President of the United States sided with Russian President Vladimir Putin in heaping scorn on the IC's assessment regarding Russian interference and called the U.S. Justice Department investigation into Russia's interference led by Special Counsel Robert Mueller "the greatest political witch hunt in history."

As the Mueller Report concluded, "The Russian government interfered in the 2016 presidential election in sweeping and systematic fashion."

In his only public remarks made since he was appointed Special Counsel, Robert Mueller reiterated at his farewell press conference held at the Department of Justice on May 29, 2017, the "central allegation of our indictments—that there were multiple, systematic efforts to interfere in our election" and that "allegation deserves the attention of every American."

Madam Speaker, American elections are to be decided by American voters free from foreign interference or sabotage, and that is why I support and urge all my colleague to vote to pass H.R. 2722, the "Securing America's Federal Elections Act" or SAFE Act.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 12½ minutes remaining.

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

□ 1000

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We have significant resources that are going to be brought to bear to build up, to fortify the election security infrastructure of our country. This is what the public wants to see. They want to be ready for the 2020 election.

We have risk-limiting audits to make sure that States across the country are figuring out what is going on. Where do we make changes? How do we protect ourselves?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Why are we here today?

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

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

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

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

No one has ever said that is the solution to too much money in politics or

to election security. Not one time have I had a constituent say that to me.

Now, we have got to come together and do what is right.

We have yet to address any of the issues that were laid out in the Mueller report. This bill we are debating today does not address any of them. This is a discussion about what happened in 2016 without a discussion of what is needed in our States and local election authorities.

That is what is wrong with this bill, too. It is hypocrisy at its greatest.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, the chair of the House Administration Committee, Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN, of whom we are very proud in California. I thank her for leading us on this path of patriotism and respecting the oath of office we take.

Madam Speaker, it is just a joy to be having this opportunity to speak out for the sacred oath to vote, the sacred blessing, the right to vote as we leave to go on the Fourth of July break.

Madam Speaker, I thank the members of the House Administration Committee: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, whom we heard from yesterday; Mr. RASKIN; Mr. AGUILAR; Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, who presented to us earlier; and to all of you.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. SARBANES. He has been the face of the future. He has been speaking out against the misrepresentations that have happened, the propagandizing that has happened by foreign governments in our election.

Yes, we won the election. We won the election because the American people were sick and tired of what the Republicans were putting forth. We won the election in the most gerrymandered, voter suppressed political arena you could imagine, and yet the American people came forward.

One the biggest messages we had in the campaign was H.R. 1, to reduce the role of dark, special-interest money in politics, to stop the systemic intentional voter suppression by the Republicans across the country, to stop political gerrymandering on all sides.

Let's do it in a nonpartisan way. Let the chips fall where they may, and to do so in a way that we are taking a piece of it today to talk about protecting our electoral system.

In a short while, we will take up the Voting Rights Act that is also part of H.R. 1.

So this H.R. 1 was very supported by the Democrats, very publicized to the American people, and part of our For the People agenda: lower healthcare costs by lowering the cost of prescription drugs and protecting the pre-existing conditions benefit; bigger paychecks by building the infrastructure

of America in a green way; cleaner government by passing H.R. 1—one of the component parts of what we are coming together around today.

As we approach the Fourth of July, we must remember the oath that we take to support and defend the Constitution and to protect the American people, which demands that this House of Representatives take urgent action.

We must legislate, we must investigate, and we must litigate to protect our national security, defend our democracy for the people.

Special Counsel Robert Mueller's report revealed an all-out attack on our elections by the Russians, concluding that they "interfered in the 2016 Presidential election in sweeping and systemic fashion."

Top intelligence and security officials have made clear that these attacks continue. They are happening, and they are happening now.

This spring, FBI Director Chris Wray warned of a "365-day-a-year threat" from the Russians, explaining that their attacks in our elections were simply "a dress rehearsal for the big show in 2020."

This House has a patriotic duty to protect our democracy from these attacks. This is a matter of national security. That is why the Democrats first act in the majority was to advance, as I mentioned, H.R. 1, For the People Act, to secure our elections.

Today we are building on that progress with the Securing America's Federal Elections Act, which takes urgently needed action to further strengthen America's defenses.

This bill closes dangerous gaps in our election systems and brings our security into the 21st century.

I know that other Members have spoken about the provisions of the bill, but I just would really like to know from my Republican friends what is wrong with replacing outdated, vulnerable voting equipment? What is wrong with requiring paper ballot voting systems to ensure the integrity of our elections? What is wrong with enacting strong cybersecurity requirements for elections technology vendors and voting systems?

We must be relentless in the defense of our democracy, fighting on all fronts to keep America safe.

There is a reason why the Russians are interfering in our elections, and other countries may be too, but we can document with full confidence from the intelligence community that the Russians are. It is because they want to affect the outcome of the elections, so they can affect the policy.

I think it was really sad, I was sad to hear, and, hopefully, it will be retracted, that the President gave a green light to the Russians to do it again. Really? Really?

This week, we are advancing appropriations legislation that provides \$600 million for election security grants to States, and increases funding for the Election Assistance Commission, which

has been starved for funding for years, a couple of dollars for every person in our country to honor the vision of our Founders of a democracy where everyone who is eligible to vote can vote and everyone's vote is counted as cast.

Next month, we will advance further legislation to protect our national security and prevent foreign interference in our elections.

Madam Speaker, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON, for the great work that he has been doing with his task force and his committee and other members who are working with him as we go forward.

We are pleased that the administration has agreed to provide an all-Member briefing on election security that will happen in July, so we can get the facts. We have been trying to get the facts.

Some people around here may think that it is okay to just make policy without the facts. We are evidence-based, scientifically oriented, truth-and-knowledge based on how we go forward, and we look forward to that briefing.

We also look forward to July 17, when Special Counsel Robert Mueller will come forward and give testimony.

Our national security is being threatened, and the American people need answers.

This is not to be fearmongering. This is to be smart and to anticipate a known challenge that exists and to do something about it.

We can't just talk about the Mueller report and saying what it says about the Russian interference in our elections, unless we are ready to do something about it. Today we are, thanks to our distinguished chair, Chairwoman LOFGREN.

There is a need for bipartisan support for our critical commonsense action to secure our elections.

Unfortunately, Senator MCCONNELL, a self-described crepehanger, has vowed to kill our bills in the Senate, while the President openly declares that he sees no problem with foreign interference in our elections.

The GOP Senate and the White House are giving foreign countries the green light to attack our country, but the House will do our patriotic duty to protect America.

Madam Speaker, as we approach the Fourth of July holiday, I urge my colleagues to remember the oath we took and the democracy we defend, and to join me in a strong bipartisan vote to defend America's security.

This isn't about politics. It is about patriotism. As our Founders said at the beginning of the Constitution in its preamble, we do this for the people.

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

Madam Speaker, I agree with my distinguished colleague from California that we do need to have the ability for the Department of Homeland Security



and our intelligence officials to notify our State and local election officials if they see nefarious activity, but right now under the bill we are debating today, that would not be the case, because in many cases, DHS won't talk to local election officials or State election officials because they don't have security clearances.

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

□ 1015

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Everything is MITCH MCCONNELL'S fault, right? He is the one who told the intelligence agencies to stand down. Are you kidding me?

And now we hear we should have done something. You are darn right we

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

And today's bill is clearly not a fix.

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

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

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

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

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

The distinguished Speaker talked about misinformation, and I agree. There is a lot of misinformation out there about elections and election security and a lot of that that goes on around here. Let's be factual here.

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

We actually had one hearing in Broward County. What is Broward County known for? Voter irregularities. Why? Many times, why? Because of paper ballots.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Washington should not be telling our local officials what to buy, especially when there are provisions in this bill that make equipment that would fit

those guidelines illegal to use or are inoperable even if they have purchased it. We have got to do better.

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

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The gentleman from Illinois has 2¾ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 9 minutes remaining.

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

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

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

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

So here we are today debating a bill that is going to basically commit 1.3 billion taxpayer dollars toward so-

called election security. We still have not addressed the problem that if DHS, if our same intelligence officials who told the Obama administration that there was foreign interference in our 2016 elections and the Obama administration did nothing about it—because, why? Because of MITCH MCCONNELL. It is MITCH MCCONNELL's fault.

Seriously, come on. Get real here. We are legislators. We are an equal branch of government. There is absolutely no way any administration cedes authority to anybody in this legislative institution.

The Obama administration failed to address the problem of election interference in 2016, and here we are today trying to make sure that we fix it. This attempt to fix it is a partisan attempt at ensuring that our elections authorities and our States and our local election officials have a top-down, federally mandated approach that is going to potentially cost them millions of taxpayer dollars that they have already inserted into their own budgets over the last few years.

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

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

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

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

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

First, we are moving forward with the SAFE Act because of a sense of urgency that we have about the 2020 election. That sense of urgency was fueled by the Director of National Intelligence, and it was fueled by the Director of the FBI who told us that red lights, warning lights were flashing and that the 2016 election was just a prelude to what the Russians were going to do in the 2020 election. We feel a sense of urgency.

As has been mentioned by others, H.R. 1 included provisions about ballot security. But I introduced this bill, the SAFE Act, on May 14 because it was specifically addressing election security, and, also, we made some additional enhancements to H.R. 1 relative to cybersecurity and the like.

□ 1030

We drafted the bill with the assistance of the Parliamentarian so that it

was entirely within the jurisdiction of the House Administration Committee, with one exception. There was a line on page 11 of the committee mark that authorized a study by the NSF. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee waived jurisdiction on markup because it was just a study, and that was very clear.

This bill has proceeded in the regular order. It has been noticed according to our rules. And it brings us here today to test whether we are going to meet the challenge that faces us in ballot security: whether we are going to allow the Russians to attack our country by trying to steal our election next year or not.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The idea that we would allow this just to be decided at a local level is

wrongheaded. If the Russians launched missiles at the counties of the United States, we wouldn't say, well, that is just a local issue. We would say, no, that is an attack on the United States of America.

We need to harden our systems and protect our country.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of this measure.

I would like to read from a letter that we received just yesterday from the NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice. In their last paragraph, the Catholics say:

In a secular democracy, elections are the closest thing we have to a sacrament. We know that nefarious foreign and domestic actors continue to meddle in our democratic systems, and we have been put on notice that previous efforts were only trial runs, presumably for our next election in 2020. The NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice considers our elections to be sacrosanct and that Congress must pass the SAFE Act to protect them.

This bill is supported by a broad sector of civil rights groups, including the NAACP and Common Cause. It deserves all of our support.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2722 to ensure the security of our Nation's election infrastructure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 460, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2722 is postponed.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 466 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 466**

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-21. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and con-

trolled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

**POINT OF ORDER**

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 466.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed in section 425 of that same act.

House Resolution 466 makes in order a motion "without intervention of any point of order." Therefore, I make a point of order, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget Act, that this rule may not be considered.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Madam Speaker, what we are trying to do here is bring a bill to the floor to help alleviate the suffering of children who, in my opinion, have been abused

under U.S. custody at our border. Everybody has read the news articles and everybody has seen the pictures. We have a moral obligation to move forward. To try to delay consideration of a bill to help these children I think is a mistake.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, actually, on that, we have a great deal in common with one another. We, too, think we ought to address this matter quickly.

As I am sure my friend recalls, we have tried on 16 different occasions over the last 8 weeks to bring legislation that would alleviate this problem to the floor. Our friends rejected that every single time.

We also have a bill that has been passed by the Senate 84-7: a bill where 35 Democrats—about three-quarters of the number of Democrats—supported, a bill that we know would solve, a bill that if we would bring to this floor we can pass immediately and it would go to the President's desk; it wouldn't have to go back to the Senate. So my friends, by not accepting an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill by the Senate and simply moving it on, are the ones who are actually imposing a delay here.

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

There is a simple solution here. We could simply take the Senate bill up that has passed 84-7—overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle—get that bill down to the President, and the money could start flowing immediately. If we proceed as my friends want to proceed, we are simply going to be playing ping-pong back and forth.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

On this issue, the House voted first on a measure to try to help provide some assistance to these children at the border. Then the Senate passed a different version. The way it is supposed to work is we have a negotiation and we try to come to agreement and come up with a compromise bill. So the idea that somehow we don't matter in the House, that we shouldn't matter in the House, that we should just accept whatever the Senate does, to me, I find

that disrespectful of the House of Representatives.

What we are doing is we are sending the Senate basically all that they want, plus we are adding things to help protect children and to provide for more transparency. We are strengthening requirements for children's health. We are tightening restrictions for children's safety. We are supporting nonprofits in communities caring for children's well-being. I mean, we are embracing compassionate processing for children's comfort. Again, we are enhancing accountability in transparency and mandating fiscal responsibility.

Who can possibly be opposed to those things? That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to insist that the House's voice matters, and we are trying to make the Senate bill even better.

Again, what motivates us here is the well-being of these children. We are here because we are for the children. We are here because we are outraged at the way they have been mistreated by this administration. We are tired of excuses as to why we can't protect the children. We are moving forward with legislation that will protect the children against any abuse at our border.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1045

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

Madam Speaker, I don't doubt my friend's sincerity and compassion and concern for these young people for one minute. I know him well as a person and value him as a friend. Although, I must say, this would have been much nicer 8 weeks ago when the administration first asked for it.

While my friend lays out some of the changes in the House bill, he neglected to mention that the House bill cuts the administration's request for reimbursement to the military by \$124 million. It cuts the administration's request for money to the Border Patrol, which is probably where the most difficult part is, by, I think, \$89 million. So we have substantive disagreements.

Again, we have a bill that has passed overwhelmingly. Many of the items my friends want to add have already been considered by the Senate and rejected by the Senate. So it seems to me, when we have a bipartisan product that has got substantial support on both sides and that the White House has signaled it would accept, that is the way we should go.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the question on consideration. We should be taking up the Senate-passed

bill. It has already been mentioned that it passed 84-8.

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

Yesterday, in a budget hearing on matters of immigration, we heard testimony from the mayor of Yuma, Arizona, which clearly demonstrates the economic impacts and costs that States and local governments are incurring due to the crisis at the border.

My friends just said changes made by the House on this Senate-passed bill take tens of millions of dollars away from the Department of Defense for reimbursement and limit the ability of Customs and Border Patrol to adequately pay for the services incurred as a result of this ongoing crisis.

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

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

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

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

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

Enough is enough. We need to make sure that we not only provide the necessary resources to alleviate this crisis, but we need to make sure that those resources we provide are provided in such a way that they do go to the purposes that we want them to go to.

And as far as the Department of Defense money, I mean, the bottom line is this administration has been diverting funds from the Department of Defense for this stupid wall, and they have created that crisis.

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

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my very good friend and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I think folks are going to have a tough time containing their emotions today. We met in the House Rules Committee at 8 a.m. this morning, and folks already had fuses that were running short.

I agree with my friend from Massachusetts, enough is enough.

We had an amendment offered in the Rules Committee this morning. I don't think most folks in this body know because folks weren't at the Rules Committee this morning. We had an amendment offered in the Rules Committee this morning that said, if the gentleman wants to do this new bill that has been crafted by the Democratic majority, bring that new bill to the floor, but let's at least consider the bipartisan bill that passed the Senate, resoundingly, 84-8 yesterday.

I agree with my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), enough is enough, Madam Speaker. We could send a bill to the White House today to start the money going today.

My friend from Massachusetts said: Let the Republicans talk if they want to. We want to talk about the children.

I am tired of talking about the children. Let's serve the children. Let's do it. Let's do it. Let's stop talking about it.

It has been almost 60 days that we have been talking about it, with one tragic picture after another rolling across the national headlines. Let's stop talking about it.

If folks have an alternative view, they can share alternative view as they have, but allow us to vote on what the Senate agreed, 84-8, after roundly rejecting the previously passed House language, was an opportunity to serve the children today.

Madam Speaker, I don't believe the Members of this institution know what happened in the Rules Committee this morning. I don't believe the Members of this institution know we rejected that bipartisan opportunity this morning. With this, under a point of order, we will bring the Members of this institution down here to the House floor where they will hear it themselves.

We have an opportunity to act now, as my friend from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) has offered. The question is: Are we going to take "yes" for an answer or are we just going to continue to talk about the children?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am really puzzled here. Why is it that the Senate can say no, but the House can't say no to something? Why is it that we always have to do what the Senate wants?

If the gentleman is so enamored with the Senate, maybe he should work over in the Senate.

But the bottom line is, those of us in the House deserve to have our voices heard, and what we are saying here is that we want to provide a bill that will alleviate this crisis, that will help the children.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

I do not want to be part of an effort to send money to the border to be diverted for whatever this President wants. He has shown us where he is on this issue of the children and on the issue of immigration. And, quite frankly, many of us on this side of the aisle—and, I think, some on the other side of the aisle—are offended by that.

So we want to make sure, when we say we are providing relief to this crisis that is affecting so many children, that, in fact, we are providing relief to those children. And that is all we are saying here.

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

That is not what my friends want to do. They want to prolong the debate. They have prolonged it for 2 months, for 8 weeks, by not taking the matter up. They are prolonging it today by not taking what has already been passed and moving along.

So, obviously, we oppose this rule, and we want to move on. We will be happy to work with them to move on the Senate legislation. I think it would

pass in an overwhelmingly bipartisan way; the President would sign it; and that aid would begin flowing. What my friends are proposing is quite the opposite. It is a prolonged back-and-forth with the United States Senate.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, anybody who has seen the pictures in the newspapers recently, anybody who has read the news articles, again, our hearts should ache.

This is not America. This is not what our country is about. We can do much, much better, and that is why we should move forward with consideration.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has ¾ minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, we don't think the House bill is a better bill. We don't think reducing the amount the Senate gave to the military by \$124 million is a good idea. We don't think reducing the amount of money that is going to Border Patrol, which is one of the areas that is a problem, by \$89 million is a good idea. We don't think a lot of this effort to micromanage a crisis that is thousands of miles away from us by this body here has good suggestions.

We want some flexibility. We think the Senate bill does take care of the

needs on the border in terms of unaccompanied minors who have crossed over into our territory. So we just don't think this does it, and we think this prolongs the process.

We have a bipartisan bill—a perfect bill? No. Is our bill a perfect bill? No. As a matter of fact, we like the Senate bill on our side better than this bill. Regardless, that one can pass. That one can pass on this floor. That one can be signed into law.

This one that my friends are embarking on, they think it is an improvement. I will just tell them, politically, not passing the Senate, not likely to be signed by the President.

So if we want to get help there immediately, we have a way to do it in the Senate bill. We think this leads us to a political dead-end.

Madam Speaker, I would press for my motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, my colleagues have seen the pictures and they have heard the stories. And if that is not convincing to them to move forward, to increase protections for children who are held in our custody, then I don't know what else to say.

What we are asking for here in this compromise bill that we are moving forward is to make sure that there are stronger protections in here, to make sure that the abuse that we have all read about and that we have all seen stops and never, ever happens again. That is what this is all about.

So I am at a loss because, to me, the evidence is overwhelming that we need to provide stronger protections for these children. If my colleagues disagree, then they can vote against the bill and against consideration, but I would urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" so that we can move forward with this rule in consideration of this bill and get this passed as soon as possible and get on to either urging the Senate to pass it or to continue in negotiation, but we can do better than the Senate bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 188, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

YEAS—226

Adams	Beatty	Bonamici
Aguilar	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Allred	Beyer	F.
Axne	Bishop (GA)	Brindisi
Barragán	Blumenauer	Brown (MD)
Bass	Blunt Rochester	Brownley (CA)

Bustos	Hill (CA)	Pascarell	Herrera Beutler	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Butterfield	Himes	Payne	Hice (GA)	McKinley	Smith (NJ)
Carbajal	Horn, Kendra S.	Perlmutter	Higgins (LA)	Meadows	Smucker
Cardenas	Horsford	Peters	Hill (AR)	Meuser	Spano
Carson (IN)	Houlihan	Peterson	Holding	Miller	Stauber
Cartwright	Hoyer	Phillips	Hollingsworth	Mitchell	Stefanik
Case	Jackson Lee	Pingree	Hudson	Moolenaar	Steil
Casten (IL)	Jayapal	Pocan	Huizenga	Mooney (WV)	Steube
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Porter	Hunter	Newhouse	Stewart
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Pressley	Hurd (TX)	Norman	Stivers
Ciulline	Johnson (TX)	Price (NC)	Johnson (LA)	Nunes	Taylor
Cisneros	Kaptur	Quigley	Johnson (OH)	Olson	Thompson (PA)
Clark (MA)	Keating	Raskin	Johnson (SD)	Palazzo	Thornberry
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)	Jordan	Palmer	Timmons
Clay	Kennedy	Richmond	Joyce (OH)	Pence	Tipton
Cleaver	Khanna	Rose (NY)	Joyce (PA)	Perry	Turner
Clyburn	Kildee	Rouda	Katko	Posey	Upton
Cohen	Kilmer	Royal-Allard	Keller	Ratcliffe	Wagner
Connolly	Kim	Ruiz	Kelly (MS)	Reed	Walberg
Cooper	Kind	Ruppersberger	Kelly (PA)	Reschenthaler	Walden
Correa	Kirkpatrick	Rush	King (IA)	Rice (SC)	Walker
Costa	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez	King (NY)	Rigglesman	Waltz
Courtney	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes	Kinzinger	Roby	Watkins
Cox (CA)	Lamb	Scanlon	LaHood	Rodgers (WA)	Weber (TX)
Craig	Langevin	Schakowsky	LaMalfa	Roe, David P.	Webster (FL)
Crist	Larsen (WA)	Schiff	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Wenstrup
Crow	Larson (CT)	Schneider	Latta	Rose, John W.	Westerman
Cuellar	Lawrence	Schrader	Lesko	Rouzer	Williams
Cummings	Lawson (FL)	Schriener	Long	Roy	Wilson (SC)
Cunningham	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)	Loudermilk	Rutherford	Wittman
Davids (KS)	Lee (NV)	Serrano	Luetkemeyer	Scalise	Womack
Davis (CA)	Levin (CA)	Sewell (AL)	Marshall	Schweikert	Woodall
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (MI)	Shalala	Massie	Scott, Austin	Wright
Dean	Lewis	Sherman	Mast	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Sherrill	McCarthy	Shimkus	Young
DeGette	Lipinski	Sires	McCaul	Simpson	Zeldin
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Slotkin	McClintock	Smith (MO)	
DelBene	Lofgren	Smith (WA)			
Delgado	Lowenthal	Soto			
Demings	Lowey	Spanberger	Abraham	Huffman	Rogers (AL)
DeSaulnier	Lujan	Speier	Castro (TX)	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney (FL)
Deutch	Luria	Stanton	Crenshaw	Lucas	Ryan
Dingell	Lynch	Stevens	DesJarlais	Marchant	Scott, David
Doggett	Malinowski	Suozzi	Gabbard	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)
Doyle, Michael	Maloney,	Takano	Hastings	Mullin	Walorski
F.	Carolyn B.	Thompson (CA)			
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)			
Escobar	Matsui	Titus			
Eshoo	McAdams	Tlaib			
Espallat	McBath	Tonko			
Evans	McCollum	Torres (CA)			
Finkenauer	McEachin	Torres Small			
Fletcher	McGovern	(NM)			
Foster	McNerney	Trahan			
Frankel	Meeks	Trone			
Fudge	Meng	Underwood			
Gallego	Moore	Van Drew			
Garamendi	Morelle	Vargas			
Garcia (IL)	Mucarsel-Powell	Veasey			
Garcia (TX)	Murphy	Vela			
Golden	Nadler	Velázquez			
Gomez	Napolitano	Visclosky			
Gonzalez (TX)	Neal	Wasserman			
Gottheimer	Neguse	Schultz			
Green, Al (TX)	Norcross	Waters			
Grijalva	O'Halleran	Watson Coleman			
Haaland	Ocasio-Cortez	Welch			
Harder (CA)	Omar	Wexton			
Hayes	Pallone	Wild			
Heck	Panetta	Wilson (FL)			
Higgins (NY)	Pappas	Yarmuth			

## NAYS—188

Aderholt	Byrne	Fleischmann
Allen	Calvert	Flores
Amash	Carter (GA)	Fortenberry
Amodei	Carter (TX)	Foxx (NC)
Armstrong	Chabot	Fulcher
Arrington	Cheney	Gaetz
Babin	Cline	Gallagher
Bacon	Cloud	Gianforte
Baird	Cole	Gibbs
Balderson	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Banks	Collins (NY)	Gonzalez (OH)
Barr	Comer	Gooden
Bergman	Conaway	Gosar
Biggs	Cook	Granger
Billirakis	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Curtis	Graves (LA)
Bost	Davidson (OH)	Graves (MO)
Brady	Davis, Rodney	Green (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Griffith
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Grothman
Buchanan	Duncan	Guest
Buck	Dunn	Guthrie
Bucshon	Emmer	Hagedorn
Budd	Estes	Harris
Burchett	Ferguson	Hartzler
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	Hern, Kevin

the bodies of Oscar Alberto Martinez Ramirez and his nearly 2-year-old daughter, Valeria. They were taken on Monday as these Salvadoran migrants tried to cross the Rio Grande after leaving a Mexican migrant camp. Like so many others, they were exercising their legal right to seek asylum here in the United States. They wanted to be free from the violence, gangs, poverty, and inequality that is rampant in El Salvador, just as it is all across Central America.

I visited El Salvador and I visited Honduras recently, and, Mr. Speaker, I saw the unbearable conditions with my own eyes. It is no wonder that organizations like the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime have said this and other Central American countries are more dangerous than Afghanistan and only slightly better than Syria.

Syria, Mr. Speaker, is the site of an ongoing civil war. Let that sink in for a moment.

But, unfortunately, Alberto and Valeria didn't survive their journey. Alberto's wife, Tania, was forced to watch in horror as a current washed her family away.

I am telling their story today because this is what migrants face as they risk their lives to come to this country—not to transport drugs, not to commit crimes, as the President suggests, but to find refuge, to raise their daughter in a safe place, and to have a chance at building a better life, a life that they could only find in America.

Isn't this what each of us wants for our own families?

They came to present themselves at a legal port of entry and to seek legal asylum, as is their right under U.S. law.

And they weren't the only ones to die. Just this past weekend, Border Patrol agents found four more bodies in the river west of Brownsville, Texas: three more young children and a young woman in her twenties.

Every single week, people drown in the river and perish in the deserts, invisible and unknown.

It wasn't too long ago that we celebrated how immigration made our country stronger, whether it was a Democratic or a Republican administration.

I am reminded of President Reagan's final speech in office, where he said:

Anybody, from any corner of the world, can come to America to live and become an American. This, I believe, is one of the most important sources of America's greatness.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration apparently has the complete opposite view of immigration. They don't celebrate it; they demonize it.

Consider what may have happened to Oscar and his family if they did make it to our border, forced to sleep on concrete floors with the lights on 24 hours a day, with no soap, no medicine, maybe not even a toothbrush, Valeria separated from her parents, because that is what migrants are forced to endure at border facilities under this President.

## NOT VOTING—18

Abraham	Huffman	Rogers (AL)
Castro (TX)	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney (FL)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Ryan
DesJarlais	Marchant	Scott, David
Gabbard	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)
Hastings	Mullin	Walorski

□ 1128

Messrs. BIGGS, YOUNG, and TIMMONS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, 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. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 466, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3401. One hour of general debate has been provided, controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I think, by now, we all have seen the horrific images showing

A physician who visited one recently said: "The conditions within which they are held could be compared to torture facilities."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Two days ago, I warned that the bill the House was considering would not pass the Senate and would not become law, and I was proven correct. The House bill failed in the Senate. In fact, it only received 37 votes in support. In contrast, the Senate amendment passed in a bipartisan vote of 84-8.

If the Democratic leadership would allow a vote on the Senate text, I believe it would pass this Chamber today and be on its way to the President's desk—today. But, instead, we are here considering a rule that would further amend the bill, bringing back in provisions that have already failed to garner support in the Senate.

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

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

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

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

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

What I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, is why the majority is so resistant to acting in a bipartisan manner here. Both Republicans and Democrats agree that we need additional funding to ad-

dress the crisis on the southern border. There is a real chance to send a bipartisan bill to the President that will become law. And, instead of doing what will immediately help children and families at the border, the majority is attempting to cut the needed funding from the Senate bill, add partisan riders back into it, and then send it back to the Senate, where it can fail again.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Senate took up a bill to take up this crisis. The vote was 84-8.

□ 1145

Madam Speaker, 84-8. There has been historic legislation that was passed with much less, but there have been very few that have ever been defeated that have gone 84-8.

But today, we are going to take hours to learn the exact same experience that we had just a few, short hours ago. The 84-8—when I listen to the other side and say that this—the Democratic Party, Madam Speaker, wants to do this.

Let me read the names of some of those who voted for this bill to understand what bipartisan sounds like: Senator CHUCK SCHUMER, Senator DICK DURBIN, Senator TIM KAINE, Senator PATTY MURRAY, and Senator DIANE FEINSTEIN all voted “yes.” Every single member of the Senate Democratic leadership voted “yes” to end the crisis on the border.

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHUCK SCHUMER is the leader of the Democratic Party. DICK DURBIN is the leader of the Democrats when it comes to immigration. I have spent hours and months with DICK DURBIN in a room trying to come to an immigration agreement, and we have seen places far, far apart. We have spent months trying to come to a conclusion.

But you know what? We have this time. We have found a more perfect union when we found bipartisanship.

But are we going to allow a few to continue to deny it?

Fifty-eight days. You do not have more. The money is gone. The time is now.

We all know that we are better than this. I do not accuse anybody on either side of what they truly believe about a crisis. I have heard.

I have heard people on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, that said they want to vote for the Senate bill. Can we allow them to vote for the Senate bill?

Can we allow them to join with the 84 Senators out of 100 on the other side that said “yes” to it? Or do we have a few that control what can come to the floor?

Now, I heard in this rule debate that there are some amendments; that somehow they are going to make it better. What makes it better? That we do not fund to pay any overtime costs for Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers, or provide funding for the active duty of the National Guard troops working with them on the front line of the crisis at the border?

Is that making it better?

Is that really what you want to stake your political career on?

Is that really what you want to stand up against bipartisanship for?

Madam Speaker, I have heard a lot of names on the other side say they would vote for it. I think everybody in this body knows that that Senate bill will pass. I think everybody in their heart knows that is where we are going to end up.

But do we have to go through it one more time?

You do not have to worry about what the outcome will be. The leader of the Senate has already said what will happen; because I will promise you this, on this side of the aisle, we will stay here until this is done. We will not leave, and we will stand with the bipartisan vote in the Senate.

If you are worried about getting to 218, do not worry. Put that bill on suspension, I promise you it will pass.

I call upon all of our better angels for this one moment, for this one time, when America is watching, that we rise to the occasion; that we put the partisanship aside; that we have swapped; that the Senate has actually taught us, given us the adult supervision to show that, yes, we have had that fight; yes, you tried to make it and it didn't make it. But there is something better. There is a window, and there is an opportunity.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I do not yield for that purpose. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

I want to assure the distinguished minority leader that I am not asking Members of Congress to vote for what we are bringing before the House today based on their party. I am asking Members to vote their conscience.

And to be totally frank, we want to make sure there are protections built in this legislation so that funds are not misused as they have been in the past; so we don't see any more children being abused; so we don't see the mismanagement that we have witnessed.

With all due respect to the Senate majority leader, and to many of my friends on the other side of the aisle, when children were being ripped apart from their parents, we heard silence. When we read about the terrible conditions that these children were in, being denied soap, and toothpaste, and tooth-

brushes, and not being cared for, we heard silence.

When we saw the picture of Oscar and Valeria dead, trying to seek asylum in this country, there is nothing.

So the bottom line is, we want to get this done, and we will stay here as long as it takes, I assure the minority leader. We are not going anywhere.

But we are going to stand for the children, and that is what our purpose is here today.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania an additional 30 seconds.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate overwhelmingly. Ten times more Senators voted for this bill than voted against it. That is the essence of bipartisanship.

I ask that we make this House proud. I ask that we make our colleagues proud. And I ask that we pass this bill and send it to the President's desk for his signature today.

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

The Chair would advise Members that even though a unanimous consent request to consider a measure is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such requests constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

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

We must not adjourn. We will stay and do the people's work and take care of this humanitarian crisis on the border. Send this to the President's desk immediately, today, for signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for

that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained. Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, as an FBI agent who worked border security on the border, understanding it all too well, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

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

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

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

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

□ 1200

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

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

We must show the American people that bipartisanship is about solving these children's problems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose.

Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate 84-8 and could be

sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unan-

imous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose and therefore

the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

□ 1215

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles, one from The New York Times entitled: "'There is a Stench': Soiled Clothes and No Baths for Migrant Children at a Texas Center"; the other, "'The Taliban Gave Me Toothpaste': Former Captives Contrast U.S. Treatment of Child Migrants."

[From the New York Times, June 21, 2019]

'THERE IS A STENCH': SOILED CLOTHES AND NO BATHS FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN AT A TEXAS CENTER

(By Caitlin Dickerson)

A chaotic scene of sickness and filth is unfolding in an overcrowded border station in Clint, Tex., where hundreds of young people who have recently crossed the border are being held, according to lawyers who visited the facility this week. Some of the children have been there for nearly a month.

Children as young as 7 and 8, many of them wearing clothes caked with snot and tears, are caring for infants they've just met, the lawyers said. Toddlers without diapers are relieving themselves in their pants. Teenage mothers are wearing clothes stained with breast milk.

Most of the young detainees have not been able to shower or wash their clothes since they arrived at the facility, those who visited said. They have no access to toothbrushes, toothpaste or soap.

[Hundreds of migrant children have now been transferred out of the facility.]

"There is a stench," said Elora Mukherjee, director of the Immigrants' Rights Clinic at Columbia Law School, one of the lawyers who visited the facility. "The overwhelming majority of children have not bathed since they crossed the border."

Conditions at Customs and Border Protection facilities along the border have been an issue of increasing concern as officials warn that the recent large influx of migrant families has driven many of the facilities well past their capacities. The border station in Clint is only one of those with problems.

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

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

Gov. Greg Abbott of Texas on Friday announced the deployment of 1,000 new National Guard troops to the border to help respond to the continuing new arrivals, which the governor said have amounted to more than 45,000 people from 52 countries over the past three weeks.

"The crisis at our southern border is unlike anything we've witnessed before and has put an enormous strain on the existing resources we have in place," Mr. Abbott said, adding, "Congress is a group of reprobates for not addressing the crisis on our border."

The number of border crossings appears to have slowed in recent weeks, possibly as a

result of a crackdown by the Mexican government under pressure from President Trump, but the numbers remain high compared to recent years. The overcrowding crisis has been unfolding invisibly, with journalists and lawyers offered little access to fenced-off border facilities.

The reports of unsafe and unsanitary conditions at Clint and elsewhere came days after government lawyers in court argued that they should not have to provide soap or toothbrushes to children under the legal settlement that gave Ms. Mukherjee and her colleagues access to the facility in Clint. The result of a lawsuit that was first settled in 1997, the settlement set the standards for the detention, treatment and release of migrant minors taken into federal immigration custody.

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

She said the conditions in Clint were the worst she had seen in any facility in her 12-year career. "So many children are sick, they have the flu, and they're not being properly treated," she said. The Associated Press, which first reported on conditions at the facility earlier this week, found that it was housing three infants, all with teen mothers, along with a 1-year-old, two 2-year-olds and a 3-year-old. It said there were dozens more children under the age of 12.

Ms. Mukherjee said children were being overseen by guards for Customs and Border Protection, which declined to comment for this story. She and her colleagues observed the guards wearing full uniforms—including weapons—as well as face masks to protect themselves from the unsanitary conditions.

Together, the group of six lawyers met with 60 children in Clint this week who ranged from 5 months to 17 years old. The infants were either children of minor parents, who were also detained, or had been separated from adult family members with whom they had crossed the border. The separated children were now alone, being cared for by other young detainees.

"The children are locked in their cells and cages nearly all day long," Ms. Mukherjee said. "A few of the kids said they had some opportunities to go outside and play, but they said they can't bring themselves to play because they are trying to stay alive in there."

When the lawyers arrived, federal officials said that more than 350 children were detained at the facility. The officials did not disclose the facility's capacity but said the population had exceeded it. By the time the lawyers left on Wednesday night, border officials told them that about 200 of the children had been transferred elsewhere but did not say where they had been sent.

"That's what's keeping me up at night," Ms. Mukherjee said.

Some sick children were being quarantined in the facility. The lawyers were allowed to speak to the children by phone, but their requests to meet with them in person and observe the conditions they were being held in were denied.

The children told the lawyers they were given the same meals every day—instant oats for breakfast, instant noodles for lunch, a frozen burrito for dinner, along with a few cookies and juice packets—which many said was not enough. "Nearly every child I spoke with said that they were hungry," Ms. Mukherjee said.

Another group of lawyers conducting inspections under the same federal court settlement said they discovered similar conditions earlier this month at six other facilities in Texas. At the Border Patrol's Central Processing Center in McAllen, Tex.—often known as “Ursula”—the lawyers encountered a 17-year-old mother from Guatemala who couldn't stand because of complications from an emergency C-section, and who was caring for a sick and dirty premature baby.

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

After government lawyers argued in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco this week that amenities such as soap and toothbrushes should not be mandated under the legal settlement originally agreed to between the government and migrant families in 1997 and amended several times since then, all three judges voiced dismay.

Among the guidelines set under the legal settlement are that facilities for children must be “safe and sanitary.”

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

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

“THE TALIBAN GAVE ME TOOTHPASTE”: FORMER CAPTIVES CONTRAST U.S. TREATMENT OF CHILD MIGRANTS

(By Deanna Paul)

[June 25, 2019]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

He said he was given toothpaste, soap, a daily shower and a foam mattress.

Recent reports have surfaced describing U.S. border detainees held in cages of chain-link fencing, sleeping on concrete and covered with blankets made of aluminum foil, allegations that Customs and Border Protection officials dispute.

On Tuesday, the agency said that children in custody receive “continuous access to hygienic products and adequate food” while awaiting shelter placement.

Somali pirates gave me toothpaste & soap. <https://twitter.com/novthisnews/status/1142151178177978368> . . .

An executive editor at [newyorker.com](http://newyorker.com), David Rohde, contributed to the online conversation, too.

“The Taliban gave me toothpaste & soap,” he wrote on Twitter, drawing from the seven months he spent as a hostage of the Taliban. Rohde said he was not abused in their custody, though the group is known for abusing its captives.

The online thread with former prisoners has been liked nearly half a million times. Washington Post Global opinions writer Jason Rezaian, who was held in Iranian custody for a year and a half and has an ongoing lawsuit against the Iranian government, also responded on Twitter.

“I felt if I didn't chime in, it would be the height of hypocrisy,” Rezaian told The Post on Tuesday, calling U.S. treatment of children at the border misaligned with “what this country stands for.” “The government is treating them like they're statistics, ‘the other’ and not deserving of basic humanity.”

From the first day in captivity, Rezaian was permitted to shower regularly. He was also given a toothbrush and toothpaste. Rezaian asked, “If we're going to treat the most vulnerable people this way, what does that say about our actual values?”

I had a toothbrush and toothpaste—not exactly Aquafresh or Tom's—from the first night. Actually, I had almost nothing else in my cell while I was in solitary confinement. I was allowed to shower every couple of days. <https://twitter.com/yashar/status/1142546005688311808> . . .

The case heard on Tuesday stems from a motion filed under the Obama administration. In part, it argued that Customs and Border Protection was holding children in detention facilities that were not “safe and sanitary,” in violation of a 1997 precedent.

The Trump administration, however, opted to bring the appeal, asking the panel of three judges to condone current custody conditions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, the last thing I would want to see is a repeat of the other night when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle laughed and jeered as I described the situation at the border and what is happening to the children in our custody.

Madam Speaker, the minority leader earlier asked why are we here again—one word, “oversight”—“oversight.”

We have seen, as Members of Congress, too often, our desire to provide oversight, which is a fundamental responsibility, a fundamental duty of ours, we have seen it thwarted and we have seen it obstructed.

There is no one in this Chamber right now who feels more of a sense of urgency than the Representative from Texas 16, El Paso, where we have had a front row to the atrocities occurring at the hands of this government.

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

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

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

So oversight is why our bill is the better bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great

State of Idaho (Mr. FULCHER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), my friend and newest Member of the House of Representatives, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

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

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

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

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and

could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1230

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate 84-8 and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today. Let's vote on it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), my very good

friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

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

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, point of order.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has reserved his time.

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

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

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

Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

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

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

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

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

How they want to improve the bill, you may ask? Well, let's start by sim-

ply reducing or eliminating border security, that appears to be optional to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They want to take a hatchet to ICE. These are law enforcement personnel.

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

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

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

And I ask for your attention over there, sir, unless, of course, you decided that policy is being made by a fragment of your conference, unless you decided that you are going to turn over the gavel to a fragment of your conference to make decisions for you, which may well appear to be the case. But let's be honest to the American people and tell them that a fragment, a small portion, of your conference is now functioning as a Speaker of the House.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. What we just witnessed was really interesting. In the amount of time that it took my friends on the other side of the aisle to get through those antics, we could have passed this bill. That is what urgency looks like. Not political theater. These kids that we are here to try to protect deserve more than grandstanding. They deserve things like medicine. They deserve things like soap and clothing.

And my Republican friends say they don't want to waste time, but they wasted a hell of a lot of time with what we just saw happen.

And just one other observation. In all the other editorial comments that were made, I didn't hear the word "children" mentioned once. I mean, it is telling, because that is what this debate is all about. It is not about grandstanding, and it is not about more money for cages to put kids in. It is about the children. And I am sorry that the children who are suffering under U.S. custody are such an afterthought.

And to the gentleman from Michigan, I am outraged, too. I am outraged that the terrible conditions that these kids have been forced to experience happened under U.S. custody. I am outraged that that would happen in the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut

(Ms. DELAURO), the distinguished chairwoman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this emergency supplemental bill.

Madam Speaker, the principles guiding this bill were clear from the outset. It is a response to a humanitarian crisis.

By increasing the housing capacity at Health and Human Services to moving these vulnerable children from the detention centers at Customs and Border Protection as quickly as possible to Health and Human Services, because we know what the conditions are at CBP. They are deplorable. In fact, it is government-sponsored child abuse.

We wanted to build in the protections for children that have been nonexistent in the past, and we uncovered those abuses. They have been reported in the press. The Miami Herald just recently said they are "prison-like conditions" at Homestead.

And we wanted to place children with a sponsor in a safe placement, a safe environment, as expeditiously as possible to reverse the administration's policy of frightening sponsors to come forward.

This bill includes strong protections and safeguards for these vulnerable children; it extends to the influx shelters' enhanced standards of care. And, my friends, it is for the first time ever. These protections have never been required of these influx shelters.

It continues to prevent the waiving of core standards and protections after 6 months.

It continues to hold influx shelters accountable by requiring HHS to remove an operator if they do not comply with these core standards.

□ 1245

If the shelter is not in compliance, then HHS is required to award the contract to a new service provider, and the bill continues to protect sponsors and potential sponsors by extending a provision that prohibits funds from being used to put anyone into a removal proceeding based on information from HHS' sponsor-vetting process.

The bill continues to require HHS to maintain the directives that they issued in December that removed bureaucratic barriers and have helped to place these children with sponsors as expeditiously as possible. And the bill continues to require HHS to report to Congress within 24 hours if an unaccompanied child dies in HHS custody.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Connecticut an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, a child did die in HHS custody. No one knew about this for 8 months, and it was only the news media that uncovered it. A child died.

This bill continues to ensure that Members of Congress can conduct oversight visits of shelters without being required to provide advance notice, and the bill continues to protect taxpayer funding by prohibiting funds from being diverted to programs outside of Health and Human Services. This bill provides clear direction, legal guardrails, about how our emergency funds should be used, and this bill wages the battle for the vulnerable.

Madam Speaker, I urge every Member of this House to support this bill.

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to simply concur in the Senate amendment without further amendment. This will immediately send the bill to the President and deliver the necessary resources needed to respond to this humanitarian crisis.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, let me just say again, we can solve this problem now.

I respect that my friends have strong feelings about their legislation. We all do. The reality is that that legislation is not going to get through the Senate; it is not going to be signed by the President.

We have a vehicle that has already gotten through the Senate, that 75 percent of the Democrats in the Chamber voted for, including the entire Democratic leadership, and that could go, if this House would act on it, straight to the President's desk and be signed into law.

Now, my friends are, I know, concerned about resources. And, again, it is nice that they are. It would have been nice if, in the 18 previous times we have tried to bring this matter up before the House, they would have helped. It would have been nice if, 2 months ago, we had actually seen them respond.

We share their concern for these young people. That is why we asked for extra resources. The administration asked for extra resources 58 days ago. So I think, again, this ought to be pretty easy to resolve here.

My friends, with all due respect, have a partisan bill that will pass along partisan lines in this House, that will not be enacted by the Senate, and that will not be signed by the President.

The Senate has a bill they have already passed in a bipartisan fashion. It, frankly, has more money to help the people who are being paid overtime in the Border Patrol to—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gal-

lery in contravention of the law and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The gentleman from Oklahoma may continue.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker personally for taking control of a difficult situation.

So, Madam Speaker, just to resume my point, we have a vehicle. It could literally pass on this floor in less than an hour. It could head to the President. It satisfies almost all—not all, but almost all—of my friends' concerns. I would just ask them, in all seriousness, to just consider political reality here and let's get this done and get these resources to where they are needed. We can do that. We can do it in a bipartisan fashion.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles: One from Vox, entitled, "The Horrifying Conditions Facing Kids in Border Detention, Explained," and another from Time magazine, entitled, "Lawyers Say Migrant Children Are Living in 'Traumatic and Dangerous' Conditions at Border Detention Site."

[From Vox, June 25, 2019]

THE HORRIFYING CONDITIONS FACING KIDS IN BORDER DETENTION, EXPLAINED

(By Dara Lind)

On any given day, 2,000 children are in Border Patrol custody, and the problems are hardly confined to one facility.

At any given time, for the past several weeks, more than 2,000 children have been held in the custody of US Border Patrol without their parents. Legally, they're not supposed to be held by border agents for more than 72 hours before being sent to the Department of Health and Human Services, which is responsible for finding their nearest relative in the US to house them while their immigration cases are adjudicated.

In practice, they're being held for days, sometimes weeks, in facilities without enough food or toothbrushes—going days without showering, overcrowded and undercared for.

Late last week, the conditions of that detention in one facility in Clint, Texas, became public when investigators, checking on the US government's obligations under the Flores agreement (which governs the care of immigrant children in US custody), were so horrified that they turned into public whistleblowers and spoke to the Associated Press about what they saw.

The stories they told have horrified much of America. The past several days have seen growing outrage, and the acting commissioner of Customs and Border Protection (which oversees CBP) announced his resignation Tuesday (though officials maintain the outrage didn't cause the resignation).

But the problem goes beyond one official—or one facility.

The story gained even wider traction after Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez's (D-NY) reference to the detention facilities as "concentration camps," and the ensuing debate over whether that term was appropriate.

The US government's response was to move the children out of the Clint facility—and move another group of children in.

On Monday, officials confirmed that all 350 of the children there last week would be

moved to other facilities by Tuesday; about 250 of them have been placed with HHS, and the remainder are being sent to other Border Patrol facilities. But on Tuesday morning, a Customs and Border Protection official told a New York Times reporter on a press call that about a hundred children were currently being housed at Clint.

That's illustrative of the hectic improvisation that's characterized much of the Trump administration's response to the current border influx. It's a problem that is much, much bigger than the problems at a single facility. Indeed, the problems investigators identified at Clint are problems elsewhere as well.

The lone member of the team of legal investigators who visited the El Paso facility in which many children were sent from Clint—called "Border Patrol Station 1"—told Vox that conditions there were just as bad as they were in Clint, with the same problems of insufficient food, no toothbrushes, and aggressive guards.

The problem isn't the Clint facility. The problem is the hastily-cobbled-together system of facilities Customs and Border Protection (the agency which runs Border Patrol) has thrown together in the last several months, as the unprecedented number of families and children coming into the US without papers has overwhelmed a system designed to swiftly deport single adults.

It is apparent that even an administration acting with the best interests of children in mind at every turn would be scrambling right now. But policymakers are split on how much of the current crisis is simply a resource problem—one Congress could help by sending more resources—and how much is deliberate mistreatment or neglect from an administration that doesn't deserve any more money or trust.

Border Patrol isn't prepared to care for children at all. It's now housing 2,000 a day.

According to statistics sent to congressional staff last week and obtained by Vox, between May 14 and June 13, US Border Patrol facilities were housing over 14,000 people a day—and sometimes as many as 18,000. (The most recent tally, as of June 13, was nearly 16,000.)

Most of these were single adults, or parents with children. But consistently, over that month, around 2,000—2,081 as of June 13—were "unaccompanied alien children," or children being held without adult relatives in separate facilities.

In an early June press call, a Customs and Border Protection official said, referring to the total number of people in custody, "when we have 4,000 in custody, we consider that high. 6,000 is a crisis."

Traditionally, an "unaccompanied alien child" refers to a child who comes to the US without a parent or guardian. Increasingly—as lawyers have been reporting, and as the investigators who interviewed children in detention last week confirmed—children are coming to the US with a relative who is not their parent, and being separated.

Because the law defines an "unaccompanied" child as someone without a parent or legal guardian here, border agents don't have the ability to keep a child with a grandparent, aunt or uncle, or even a sibling who's over 18, though advocates have also raised concerns that border agents are separating relatives even when there is evidence of legal guardianship.

Under the terms of US law—and especially the 1997 Flores settlement, which governs the treatment of children in immigration custody—immigration agents are obligated to get unaccompanied children out of immigration detention as quickly as possible, and to keep them in the least restrictive conditions possible while they're there. Barring emergencies, children aren't supposed to be



in Border Patrol custody for more than 72 hours before being sent to HHS—which is responsible for finding and vetting a sponsor to house the child (usually their closest relative in the United States).

That hasn't been happening. Attorneys, doctors, and human rights observers have consistently reported that children are being held by Border Patrol for days or longer before being picked up by HHS. And in the meantime, they're being kept in facilities that weren't built to hold even adults for that period of time, or in improvised "soft-sided" facilities that look like (and are commonly referred to as) tents.

The detention conditions crisis doesn't just affect children. But conditions for children are under special legal scrutiny.

Since late last year, US immigration agents have been overwhelmed by the number of families coming across the border. The US immigration system, which was built to quickly arrest and deport single Mexican adults crossing into the US to work, doesn't have the capacity to deal with tens of thousands of families (mostly from Central America) who are often seeking asylum in the US.

The length of time migrants are spending in Border Patrol custody (and the conditions there) have attracted some alarm before. In April, pictures of migrants being held outside under a bridge in El Paso, fenced in and sleeping on the ground, attracted outrage and led Border Patrol to stop holding migrants there. And in May, the DHS Office of the Inspector General released an emergency report about dangerous overcrowding of adults in two facilities: with up to 900 people being held in a facility designed to hold 125.

Because of the Flores settlement, lawyers have the opportunity to investigate conditions for children to see if the government is complying—and possibly ask a judge to intervene if it is not. That's what spurred the fact-finding mission that led to last week's stories.

The reports about Clint broke at a time when the Trump administration was already playing defense about its compliance with the Flores settlement. (While the administration is working on a regulation that would supersede the terms of the agreement, that regulation isn't expected to be published in final form until fall, and may well be held up in court.)

In a 9th Circuit Court of Appeals hearing earlier last week about whether the administration needed to allow a court appointee to monitor conditions for children in ICE and CBP custody, Department of Justice lawyer Sarah Fabian told judges that children didn't necessarily need towels or toothbrushes to be in "safe and sanitary" conditions—a clip that looked especially bad when the Clint stories came out showing the children were being denied just that.

The court hearing was not specifically about the Clint facility—it wasn't about what investigators found last week at all. And as Ken White explained for the Atlantic, Fabian's cringeworthy "safe and sanitary" argument came from the awkward stance the Trump administration has taken in this litigation: In order to challenge the court appointment of a special monitor, they argued that there's a difference between a promise to keep kids in "safe and sanitary" conditions (which the government has agreed to for decades) and a guarantee of particular items like toothbrushes.

The court appeared unimpressed. And the stories about Clint and other facilities that have come out in the ensuing days certainly bolstered the case that the Trump administration has either willingly violated its agreement to keep kids safe and healthy, or has been unable to keep it—or a mix of both.

The problem isn't Clint.

The problems that investigators identified at Clint—too many people, not enough food, no toothbrushes—weren't inherent to that facility. They were indications of an overloaded (or neglected) system.

And it's already clear that those problems go beyond Clint.

ABC News obtained testimony from a doctor who visited another facility for children in Texas—the Ursula facility—and witnessed "extreme cold temperatures, lights on 24 hours a day, no adequate access to medical care, basic sanitation, water, or adequate food." She said the conditions were so bad that they were "tantamount to intentionally causing the spread of disease."

The children are now being sent from Clint to a facility that is just as bad, according to Clara Long of Human Rights Watch, who was the only member of last week's investigative team who visited it.

Long told Vox that when she was there, the facility in El Paso known as "Border Patrol Station 1" was mostly being used as a transit center where migrants were staying only a few hours before going elsewhere. But she spoke to one family who had been held in a cell there for six days, and who voiced the same concerns that children in the Clint facility did.

The mother of the family, Long said, was so ashamed of not having clean teeth—the El Paso facility, like Clint, wasn't providing enough toothbrushes—that "when she was talking to you she would put her hand up in front of her mouth and wouldn't take it down." The teenage son said he was afraid of the guards because when he'd gotten up to go to the bathroom in the middle of the night, a guard had shoved him back into his cell and slammed the door on him. For two nights, the family had had to sleep on the cold floor without blankets.

The fundamental question: Why is it taking so long to get kids out of custody—and is it happening on purpose?

Most of the children who were at Clint when the team visited last week—about 250 of the 350—were set to be sent to HHS custody by Tuesday.

Questions remain about what is happening to the other 1,750 or so children who were in Border Patrol detention on Thursday if levels have remained static since mid-June, and why the government was able to place only 250 children over five days with the agency that's supposed to take responsibility for all children within 72 hours.

It's not clear where the bureaucratic breakdown really is—and whether it's the result of resource constraints or choices about how resources are used.

The Trump administration definitely has made a choice to keep single adults in detention, even if it could release them. Border Patrol chief Carla Provost has told Congress that "if we lose (the ability to keep and deport) single adults, we lose the border." That does raise questions about whether the overcrowding in adult facilities could be avoided.

But it doesn't address the issue of unaccompanied children, who can't simply be released with a notice to appear in immigration court. While children with parents in the US could theoretically be placed with those parents, the government is supposed to vet potential sponsors to make sure it's not placing children with traffickers—but that's the job of HHS, and the vetting doesn't begin until children are released from Border Patrol custody.

Observers and policymakers agree that HHS simply doesn't have the capacity to take migrant kids in. One Democratic Hill staffer compared it to a "jigsaw puzzle": Not only are there only so many spaces available to place a child, but the facilities available

might not match the child's particular needs. (You can't put an infant in an HHS shelter for teens, for example.) But another Hill staffer told Vox that HHS claims it's never refused a transfer for space reasons, muddying the waters.

Then there's the question of whether CBP is really doing all it can to care for kids in the time they're in CBP's care.

One of the Clint observers told Isaac Chotiner of the New Yorker stories of cruelty from some guards, indicating that they were deliberately punishing children for the sin of coming to the US without papers. But she also said that many guards were sympathetic, and told the observers that children shouldn't be in their custody—implying that they were doing the best they could and simply didn't have the resources to do more. (Advocates also say they've tried to donate supplies to Border Patrol facilities but had their donations rejected; it's not clear if this was a Border Patrol decision, or if there's a legal complication banning outside donations.)

Congress is considering a package right now to give the Trump administration billions more dollars to deal with migrants coming into the US. To Democratic leadership, including the appropriators led by Rep. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-CA), who drafted the House version of the supplemental package, the solution to poor conditions in custody is to provide more money specifically to improve those conditions. They emphasize that the bulk of the funding will go to HHS to increase capacity for migrant kids and that funding for ICE and CBP will be strictly limited to humanitarian use.

But to some progressives, led in Congress by Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, giving any money to immigration enforcement agencies right now is an endorsement of the current state of affairs.

The not-one-more-dime camp, in part, is taking a bright-line stance against the detention of children. But in part, they're demonstrating a lack of trust in the administration to adhere to any law or condition. And they assume that any money given to ICE for transit of migrant kids will, in some way or another, encourage ICE to detain more families and arrest more immigrants in the United States.

The "smart money" camp, on the other hand, believes firmly that without funds to improve conditions in detention, the conditions will only get worse.

That's especially relevant in the case of kids deemed "unaccompanied," who have to remain in custody until a sponsor is found. The past few days have demonstrated that those children are extremely vulnerable and that much of the American public wants their situation to change. It just may not be clear how.

[From Time, June 20, 2019]

LAWYERS SAY MIGRANT CHILDREN ARE LIVING IN 'TRAUMATIC AND DANGEROUS' CONDITIONS AT BORDER DETENTION SITE

(By Ccedar Attanasio, Garance Burke and Martha Mendoza)

CLINT, TEXAS.—In a tiny Texas town about a half-hour drive from El Paso, a nondescript Border Patrol station operated for six years primarily as a hub for agents on patrol, drawing little scrutiny from immigration attorneys who have been loudly advocating against mass U.S. detention camps that can hold more than 2,000 teens at a time.

And so attorneys visiting the Border Patrol station in Clint, Texas, this week said they were shocked to find more than 250 infants, children and teens inside the complex of windowless buildings, trying to care for each other with what they described as inadequate food, water and sanitation. "This facility wasn't even on our radar before we

came down here," said law professor Warren Binford, a member of the team that has interviewed 60 detainees in Clint.

Binford's group warned that because Customs and Border Protection facilities are overwhelmed with migrants, they feared similar situations could be unfolding elsewhere.

Attorney Toby Gialluca, who visited teens and their babies last week in a McAllen, Texas, Border Patrol station, said everyone she interviewed was very sick with high fevers, coughing, and wearing soiled clothes crusted with mucus and dirt after their long trip north. Fifteen kids at Clint had the flu, another 10 were quarantined. "Everyone is sick. Everyone. They're using their clothes to wipe mucus off the children, wipe vomit off the children. Most of the little children are not fully clothed," she said.

Migrant teens in McAllen told her they were offered frozen ham sandwiches and rotten food, Gialluca said. In both stations, the children told attorneys that guards instructed girls as young as age 8 to care for the babies and toddlers.

Border Patrol stations are designed to hold people for less than three days, but some children held in Clint and McAllen have been in there for weeks. Legally, migrants under 18 should be moved into Office of Refugee Resettlement care within 72 hours.

But federal officials have said they have hit a breaking point, with too many migrant children and nowhere to put them. That's in part because over the last year, migrant children have been staying longer in federal custody than they had historically, meaning there are fewer shelter beds in the separate Office of Refugee and Resettlement program where kids are sent from the Border Patrol stations.

Unlike privately contracted child detention facilities, Border Patrol stations are federal facilities, exempt from state health and safety standards, according to Texas Department of Health and Human Services spokesman John Reynolds. Child abuse and neglect investigators are not allowed to investigate the stations because they not licensed by the state.

In Clint, Binford described that during interviews with children in a conference room at the facility, "little kids are so tired they have been falling asleep on chairs and at the conference table." An 8-year-old taking care of a very small 4-year-old with matted hair could not convince the younger girl to take a shower, Binford said.

The lawyers inspected the Border Patrol facilities as part of a President Bill Clinton-era legal agreement known as the Flores settlement that governs detention conditions for migrant children and families.

Neha Desai, director of Immigration at the National Center for Youth Law, said Friday that the U.S. government, attorneys involved in the Flores settlement and an independent monitor appointed by the judge overseeing the Flores settlement are in conversation about the situation of children held in McAllen and Clint.

The Clint facility opened in 2013 with little fanfare on a country road not far from the town's water tower, a liquor store and the sandwich shop where Border Patrol agents eat lunch and dinner. The advocate lawyers who negotiated access to the complex said Border Patrol officials knew of their impending visit three weeks in advance.

Customs and Border Protection officials had no immediate comment, but have said for months that the agency is at its breaking point for housing migrants, calling the situation in the El Paso area a humanitarian and security crisis.

In an interview earlier this week with The Associated Press, Customs and Border Pro-

tection John Sanders acknowledged that children died after being in the agency's care, and said Border Patrol stations are currently holding 15,000 people—more than three times their maximum capacity of 4,000.

He urged Congress to pass a \$4.6 billion emergency funding package includes nearly \$3 billion to care for unaccompanied migrant children.

A migrant father, speaking on condition of anonymity because of his immigration status, said he did not know where his daughter was until one of the attorneys visiting Clint this week found his phone number written in permanent marker on a bracelet the girl was wearing. "She's suffering very much because she's never been alone. She doesn't know these other children," her father said.

Republican Congressman Will Hurd, whose district includes Clint, said "tragic conditions" playing out on the southern border were pushing government agencies, non-profits and Texas communities to the limit. "This latest development just further demonstrates the immediate need to reform asylum laws and provide supplemental funding to address the humanitarian crisis at our border," he said.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, before I yield to our next speaker, I would remind my colleagues that a vote to defeat the previous question really isn't a vote to bring up the Senate bill. It is a vote to give control of the House floor to the Republicans.

They say they would bring up the Senate bill, but there is absolutely no guarantee that they would. They could bring up a bill to fund a wall, for all we know.

Madam Speaker, we are here to find a way to alleviate the suffering of these children at our border and not to play political games. So I would urge my colleagues to make sure that they vote "yes" on the previous question.

And, by the way, I just say to my colleague from Oklahoma, a lot of us aren't satisfied with the Senate bill the way it has been drafted because there are protections that we want to see in that bill because, quite frankly, speaking for myself, I don't trust this administration.

I don't trust this administration to do the right thing, an administration that separated—knowingly and deliberately separated—children from their parents at the border, an administration that tolerated the conditions that have horrified the entire country.

So I want it clear that the moneys that we are appropriating are going to help children, not to continue this insane inhumane policy that has horrified this Nation.

I won't trust this administration to tell me the correct time, at this particular point. So, no, we are not satisfied. We want more protections in here for the children. We want more transparency. The American people, I think, expect that. We should provide them that information.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), the distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

Yes, indeed, we have a responsibility to act. As Speaker PELOSI has said, we

must do this for the sake of the children, and I thank her for not capitulating to the Senate demands for a blank check.

When I reflect on the number of deaths that we have seen at the border, when I reflect on the horrific conditions in facilities where children are being held in ice-cold cells with no one to care for them but a child stranger—conditions in these facilities are horrific—I ask myself: Is this the America that I came to as a young child? Is this the America that my son swore to protect when he joined the U.S. Air Force? This surely isn't the country that welcomed me as a young child from Guatemala.

But we must work toward that American ideal that we all share. We cannot simply allocate funds to agencies where we have seen numerous children die in their custody.

No blank checks.

No more torturing of babies.

No more separating infants from their mothers.

This legislation brings funds to the children that are urgently needed.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. TORRES of California. It brings more transparency to CBP and ICE and HHS, and it contains important provisions to protect children. It ensures that the emergency funding that Congress provides is spent on what it is intended for and not the President's deportation force.

So I look forward to supporting this rule, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my very good friend and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, well, here we are again, and I talked on this before.

I am from the State of Arizona, so border security is top and center of the discussion in Arizona and it has, quite frankly, been for years.

We have all known there has been a crisis at our border for many, many years, and that is why I am at least hopeful and inspired a little bit that my Democratic colleagues are actually admitting—finally—that there is a crisis at our border. So that is good.

The thing that is bad about this rule today is that I just don't understand. I guess some of my Democratic colleagues are just being stubborn because, on the one hand, you have the Senate that already passed an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill, where Senator SCHUMER voted for it. You have a President who said we are not in favor of this House version of the bill.

So here you have a President who, seemingly, is willing to sign the Senate bill; you have a Senate bill that has vast bipartisan support, even with the

top leadership in the Democrat Party; but, yet, here we are in the House, and I guess Members just want to make sure they have what they want in their bill, even if it is not going to pass and even if the money isn't going to actually get to solving the problem.

And so I ask my Democrat colleagues to put your stubbornness a little bit aside, because if we all have the goal, as has been said on both sides, to help solve this problem, to help with the children who are dying at the border, you know—what was it? Yesterday we saw the picture of the father and the daughter, and then June 14, we had a story in Arizona of a young 7-year-old girl who died, and the Arizona Air National Guard helped find and rescued other members of the party. I think we are united in trying to solve the problem, and I am glad that my Democrats finally say there is a crisis, to have acknowledged it.

But if you really want to help, let's stop this. Okay. Let's stop what you are doing, because I don't think you are going to win. You have the President on one side, the Senate on one side with bipartisan support, including Mr. SCHUMER, and yet we are here today, right before the July Fourth recess, and instead of giving in and saying let's just put up the Senate bill that we know is going to pass, that we know is going to help, you continue to, I guess, try to make a point.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Arizona an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I sincerely hope the Members have made their points, have made their talking points. Now let's get down to the business of doing what we are supposed to do in Congress: Pass a bill, pass the bipartisan Senate bill, but, also, let's work together on actually reforming our immigration laws, the root of the problem that is causing this problem, so we are not back here in 6 months or 1 year doing this again.

□ 1300

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would like to remind the gentlewoman that we are members of the Democratic Party, not the Democrat Party, and I would appreciate it if we were characterized correctly.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule.

Right now, there are thousands of children detained in temporary facilities, facilities like the ones in Homestead, which is right in the middle of my district. We have no answers. We have no idea of when these kids are going to be released. It is an overcrowded facility, with kids who are sleeping in warehouse areas on bunk beds, of more than 144 kids.

They are living in prison-like conditions. Many have been there for months. These kids should not be detained without their freedom and their rights. What we are asking from the Senate are reasonable requests for the safety and for the well-being of thousands of children.

We have to pass these provisions put forth by the House. We must put in writing that no child can be held and detained in a temporary facility like Homestead for more than 90 days.

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

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

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, many of the children have families living right here in the United States that they could be reunited with. But those who are running the facilities have no incentive for reuniting them.

The Senate bill does not have a timeline. The Senate bill is inadequate. We must pass the House-amended bill.

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

I know my friends are aware of this, but the Senate bill is actually—well, I certainly would vote for it. I think it would have overwhelming support on our side. The President, in the past, has expressed some concerns, and that is an important thing, but the Senate has really worked through a lot of these differences.

The bill that we would like to see put on this floor and that we know would pass with overwhelming, bipartisan support is a product of compromise, so much compromise that the entire Democratic leadership felt comfortable voting for it.

With all due respect to my friends, their bill is not the product of compromise. It is not going to get very many Republican votes here, if any. I would be surprised, frankly, if it did. It is not going to get accepted by the United States Senate. It absolutely won't be signed by the President of the United States.

We are all concerned about the conditions. We have been expressing that concern for 8 weeks. We never called this a manufactured crisis. We never said that this was made up for political purposes. The administration recognized it 8 weeks ago.

We have tried multiple times to get this House to focus on it. I am very pleased that we finally reached a point that both sides are focusing on it. But we also ought to focus on what is possible to achieve in a limited timeframe.

We know we are running out of money. We know there are real-life consequences to that. They are starting to unfold right now. There are services being cut back. For a lot of these conditions, frankly, we ought to look in the mirror, as Congress, and ask why we didn't get these resources there a long time ago.

Frankly, the House rule that we are discussing on the House bill, that bill

actually reduces resources at the border. It doesn't expand them. It reduces them. It reduces them also for the American military. That is part of it.

The Senate bill, in my view, frankly, is much superior to my friends' product, but it has one virtue above all: All we have to do is put it on the floor and pass it, and it goes to the President of the United States to be signed immediately. Resources begin to move to where they are desperately needed immediately.

That is not true with my friends' bill. All it does is reopen the dialogue with the Senate, where it has very little prospect of passing. Then, frankly, if it did pass—not likely—it would be vetoed.

I am befuddled, Madam Speaker, that they are pursuing a goal that they know will not work, but we have seen this time and time again. It is more important to get a bill across the floor in a partisan fashion than it is to put something on the floor that is bipartisan, that can pass the Senate and come into law.

Now, my friends know we live in an era of divided government, and we have wasted 6 months, in my view, dealing with a lot of things that we knew would never pass. But I respect my friends' right to bring their agenda to the floor.

This is different. This is a national emergency. It has to pass. We have one vehicle where it can be passed and be signed so that help can go immediately. We have my friends' vehicle, which I know they believe in passionately, and I respect that, but it can't pass.

It is pretty simple. Sooner or later, I hope we get to the obvious answer and pass the Senate bill and send it to the President.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I take offense to my colleague from Arizona saying we are not going to win. This is not a game. These are people's lives.

When my colleague says we need to try, we have tried. I am asking them to try harder because we are creating a whole generation of children, Madam Speaker, who will remember what we did. They will remember that we caged them up like animals. We ripped them away from their parents and pumped them with drugs to make them stop crying for their mothers.

No amount of apologizing and no amount of debating in this Chamber will make it better, Madam Speaker. I am asking my colleagues to be more humane, to debate real policy change that will address the crisis at the border, like comprehensive immigration reform.

We must do better for these children. Again, no amount of apologizing, no amount of debating, no amount of politicking will make it better.

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

I will just make the same point I have been making for days on end. We have something that can pass versus something that can't. I don't doubt for a minute that my friends are sincere in their concerns, but I also respect my colleagues on the other side of the rotunda in the United States Senate. I think they are sincere, too.

They have worked through and found a way to get something that got 84 votes. Three-quarters of the Democratic minority in the Senate voted for it. The entire Democratic leadership voted for it. The President has signaled that he will sign it.

We can continue the debates on some of these other things at a later point. My friends might want to come back with another piece of legislation addressing some of their concerns that they think are not appropriately addressed in the Senate bill. But the reality is that is the bill that can pass. The bill that they want to bring to this floor cannot.

We all agree there is a crisis. We all agree we need resources there. I think my friends know, if they would just put the Senate bill on the floor, it could pass, and it would go to the President.

We can continue to have this debate. We can even end it, launch some vehicle over to the Senate, and waste more time. That is all it will be, a waste of time.

I would hope we have all had our say. We all feel strongly about our points, but let's agree on the one thing we know can pass and the President would sign, which would get us resources and relief immediately on the border where we desperately need it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the gentleman from Oklahoma, but I am an optimist.

More importantly, I stand here in the name of Mr. Ramirez and his little, baby girl who were found on the shores of the Rio Grande. The question is: How did they wind up there? They wound up there because of this administration's policies that rejected them as they stood on the Brownsville-Matamoros International Bridge.

There was no reason to say the bridge was closed. They had a legal right to claim asylum, fleeing from the horrible violence of El Salvador. Yet, they could not stand there, and so this is their end.

I am supporting this bill because I believe we should not settle for just anything. This bill particularly provides for the requirements that have additional resources for these children so that they don't die, so that they do have toothpaste, that they are clean, that they are living in clean places. It acknowledges that children cannot be

held like cattle in one place beyond 90 days, that you must find their family members, and, yes, there are family members.

This is a process that has been the law of the land and the international law for decades. It is an asylum that can be sought so the Nation can address it. It takes no one's place. It does nothing to hurt this Nation.

I support the underlying legislation because, in the name of Mr. Ramirez and his child, we must do what is right.

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

I personally thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), for the professional and very patient manner in which she handled the Chair and presided over this body. I wanted to recognize that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), my very good friend.

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I, too, want to recognize my colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for having the coolest scarf in the House today, the American flag.

Bipartisanship has broken out in the Senate. They passed H.R. 3401, as amended, 84-8.

I am now happy to report to the House that bipartisanship has broken out on the floor of the House of Representatives, for I am announcing that 23 Democrats and 23 Republicans from the Problem Solvers Caucus have just issued the following statement: "Given the humanitarian crisis at the border, the Problem Solvers Caucus is asking for the immediate consideration on the House floor today of H.R. 3401, as amended by the Senate."

We now are certain that H.R. 3401 will pass. I ask us to let the bipartisanship spread to the rest of this House and put an end to this now, once and for all, and get the help to the border that is so badly needed.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 8¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I have the honor and privilege to be born as an American citizen. There are billions of people around the world who don't have that privilege, that honor, and that blessing.

Today, I get to exercise my privilege as a Member of Congress to bring my two grandchildren, ages 1 and 3, to the floor of the House of Representatives. It is a very emotional moment for me because when I see their beautiful brown eyes, I see their grandparents who were born in another country, and I see their great-grandparents born in another country, just like many people on this House floor whose grandparents

and great-grandparents came from Germany, Guatemala, Mexico, or any other place on the planet.

We are fighting to do what is right, to do what is right for the gold standard that the world has seen in the United States of America, a place of hope and a place of future for people who are fleeing persecution for religious reasons or otherwise to be able to come to this country, kiss the ground that they walk on, and start anew.

My beautiful grandkids get to be American citizens because somebody made the journey sometime before them.

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

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I will close by saying this: The United States of America has always been the gold standard, and that is the argument that we are making here today.

This is not a game. We are fighting for the lives of human beings who should have the opportunity to be just like every person on this floor: to be allowed the freedom to be who they choose to be, who God made them to be, by being in the greatest place on the planet. That is why we are fighting today.

□ 1315

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), who is my good friend.

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have a crisis on our southern border, and H.R. 3401 with the Senate amendments gets resources to give humanitarian assistance to those seeking asylum.

It also adds judges and judge teams to hear the claims of asylum. Many people have to wait up to 3 years to get their hearing. That is too long. I have twice in the last 2 weeks attempted to offer an amendment to add judge teams. Both times, the Rules Committee has failed to include it.

My amendment this week would have included the amount that was in the Senate bill, but it is now in the bill because we have the Senate bill sitting at the Speaker's desk.

I urge my colleagues to take up the bill with the Senate amendments that include judge teams. That is the only way to solve this real crisis: adjudicate the claims of these people who want asylum, reunite families, and stop people from being held in detention as long.

Mr. GONZALEZ from Texas and I have worked together on this. It is a bipartisan effort. This is a no-brainer. We need to add judges. The Senate bill does that.

Madam Speaker, I hope we can take up the Senate bill and make it happen.

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

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

Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge opposition to this rule. Once again, the majority is making the exact same mistake it made earlier this week. We have a bipartisan bill already approved by the Senate. The House should simply take it up and work its will on that bill.

Frankly, we all know, if that bill were allowed to come to the floor, it would pass overwhelmingly with a majority of each side voting in favor of it. Then it wouldn't have to go back to the Senate. It would go immediately to the President of the United States. He could sign it, and these resources would begin to flow.

Now, again, we have had a robust debate today, and I respect the passions on both sides and every point of view about this. Actually, I see a great deal of common agreement. We agree, which we did not 8 weeks ago, that there is an emergency on the southern border. We agree it is a humanitarian crisis. We agree there need to be resources that go there immediately. We agree that time is short.

We are also all elected officials who are privileged to be in this Chamber, and my experience with my friends on both sides of the aisle is that they are basically pretty practical people. They came here to solve problems. They have different viewpoints, but they are almost always very practical and try to get something done.

We know the Senate bill is not everything that my side would want. We certainly know it is not everything that my friend's side would want. But we know it is bipartisan. We know three-quarters of the Democrats in the other Chamber voted for it. We know it will pass.

With all due respect to my friends, they have clung so tightly to their bill, which I know they believe in. It will pass here, but it won't pass the Senate, and it certainly won't be signed by the President.

Where will we be if we continue down the road that they are laying out in front of us?

I know they are sincerely concerned about children on the border, but we are better off with a bill that passes so we have billions of dollars moving to where they are supposed to go, and a bill, by the way, that the entire Democratic leadership thought was appropriate and good enough.

Let's not sit here and make the perfect the enemy of the good. Let's be practical and deliver to the American people what they want, which is a solution, a solution that both parties will vote for and a solution that the President will sign.

How many times do we go home and hear that from our own constituents: Can't you guys get together and do anything? Can't you work together? Can't you put aside your differences and put the American people first?

It pains me as a House Member to admit it, I suppose, but the United

States Senate did that in this case before we did. We can accept that and move on, and my friends can continue to fight for the things they believe. It is not as if, for these things that are in this bill that the administration won't accept, they can't wrap them up again and put them back in another bill and start the process.

If we do not act, the resources will not get to the border where they are needed, and these conditions that concern us all will continue.

I urge us to step back a little bit, accept that in this case the Senate has a bipartisan solution that will work, and for goodness' sake, just put it on the floor to see what happens.

We know what will happen. My friends will vote for it in overwhelming numbers. My friends on my side of the aisle will vote for it in overwhelming numbers. It will go straight to the President of the United States.

That isn't going to solve the problem, but it is going to ease the problem, and that is going to move us in the right direction and provide our very hard-pressed people—who are working this problem by caring for the migrants, trying to protect our borders, and trying to provide justice—the resources they need to continue to work on this problem while, frankly, we continue to try to arrive at a legislative solution.

Madam Speaker, I want to end with a point I made just a little bit earlier. I thank the Chair for the patient and professional manner in which she has allowed us to conduct this debate. I thank her very much for making sure that when we had an outside disturbance, it was quickly dealt with.

I urge my friends to reconsider and, hopefully, come together around a bill that neither of us thinks is perfect but both of us could probably vote for and the President could sign.

Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for his participation in debate. It is always helpful and always enlightening. He is a good friend and a person I admire a great deal, even when we differ on a particular issue.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I think what is so frustrating to so many of us is that there is controversy around language to guarantee the protection of these children. The reason we think that is important is because this administration has ignored all the warnings.

We have had whistleblowers talk about the abuse at the border and how these children were being mistreated, and they did nothing.

This administration oversaw a policy of literally tearing children away from their parents. As a dad, I can't imagine what that must be like for any of those parents, and yet this administration thought it was fine.

We have a crisis at the border largely as a result of this President's policies.

We need to deal with it, and we need to deal with it now. But we want to make sure we are actually dealing with the crisis and not giving him more money to create other crises.

I appreciate what the gentleman from Oklahoma said about the need for us to continue to work together, and while these negotiations are continuing.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is withdrawn.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 866. An act to provide a lactation room in public buildings.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 528. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide a lactation room in public buildings, and for other purposes.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1530

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CÁRDENAS) at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 466 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 466

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-21. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be

considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), 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. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we had a robust debate here today surrounding the tragedy that is unfolding on our southern border where children are being ripped from their families; forced to sleep on cold concrete floors; denied soap, medicine, diapers—I could go on and on and on—all because of the President's failed policies.

That is what many of us believe, and that is what most national and international human rights organizations have also made clear.

Quite frankly, this should shake all of us to our core. I, for one, am very disappointed, and I will never forget the images and the stories. I will continue to fight for a better outcome and fight for these kids.

Having said all of that, it has been decided that we should move forward, so we are amending this rule so we can take up the Senate-passed bill.

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

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

I want to begin by thanking my friend. I think this is a wise decision. I know it was a difficult decision, but I think it is the right thing because I know we have a common objective here.

We know we need resources at the border right away. We know, by the action my friend is taking, we now have the possibility of making that happen and doing it in a very bipartisan way; that is, taking a bill that passed the Senate 87–8, moving it here with a very substantial bipartisan majority, and, frankly, getting resources to exactly where I know my friend and his colleagues want them to go, which is to help folks at the border deal with this ever-mounting crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we accept the amendment. I thank my friend. I thank our friends on the other side for making what I know is a tough but, I think, a very wise decision. I think the country will be better off for it.

I appreciate the fact that we will pass this legislation in a bipartisan

manner. As the Senate did, we will here. The President will sign it, and the resources that we all want to arrive and help alleviate the difficult situation at the border will start moving immediately.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Oklahoma working with us. We have spent many hours up in the Rules Committee and on the floor, and I know he is committed to trying to get this issue right.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 322, nays 85, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

YEAS—322

Adams	Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Cooper	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Agullar	Bishop (UT)	Carter (GA)	Correa	Johnson (SD)	Riggleman
Allen	Bost	Carter (TX)	Costa	Johnson (TX)	Roby
Allred	Boyle, Brendan	Cartwright	Courtney	Joyce (OH)	Rodgers (WA)
Amodei	F.	Case	Cox (CA)	Joyce (PA)	Roe, David P.
Armstrong	Brady	Casten (IL)	Craig	Katko	Rogers (KY)
Arrington	Brindisi	Castor (FL)	Crawford	Keller	Rose (NY)
Axne	Brooks (IN)	Chabot	Crenshaw	Kelly (MS)	Rose, John W.
Babin	Buchanan	Cheney	Crist	Kelly (PA)	Rouda
Bacon	Bucshon	Clay	Crow	Kildee	Rouzer
Baird	Budd	Cleaver	Cuellar	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Balderson	Burchett	Cline	Cummings	Kim	Ruppersberger
Banks	Burgess	Clyburn	Cunningham	Kind	Rush
Barr	Bustos	Cole	Curtis	King (IA)	Rutherford
Bass	Butterfield	Collins (GA)	Davids (KS)	King (NY)	Sánchez
Beatty	Byrne	Collins (NY)	Davidson (OH)	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Bera	Calvert	Comer	Davis (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Scalise
Bergman	Carbajal	Conaway	Davis, Danny K.	Kuster (NH)	Scanlon
Bilirakis	Cárdenas	Cook	Davis, Rodney	LaHood	Schiff
			Dean	LaMalfa	Schneider
			DeLauro	Lamb	Schrier
			DelBene	Lamborn	Schweikert
			Demings	Langevin	Scott (VA)
			DesJarlais	Larsen (WA)	Scott, Austin
			Deutch	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
			Diaz-Balart	Latta	Serrano
			Doyle, Michael	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (AL)
			F.	Lee (NV)	Shalala
			Duffy	Lesko	Sherman
			Duncan	Levin (CA)	Sherrill
			Dunn	Lieu, Ted	Shimkus
			Emmer	Lipinski	Simpson
			Engel	Loeb sack	Sires
			Eshoo	Long	Slotkin
			Estes	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
			Evans	Lowey	Smith (NE)
			Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
			Finkenauer	Luria	Smucker
			Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Spanberger
			Fleischmann	Maloney, Sean	Spano
			Fletcher	Marchant	Speier
			Flores	Marshall	Stanton
			Fortenberry	Mast	Stauber
			Foster	Matsui	Stefanik
			Fox (NC)	McAdams	Steil
			Fudge	McBath	Stevens
			Fulcher	McCarthy	Stewart
			Gallagher	McCaul	Stivers
			Garamendi	McClintock	Suozzi
			Gianforte	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
			Gibbs	McEachin	Thompson (MS)
			Golden	McGovern	Thompson (PA)
			Gonzalez (OH)	McHenry	Timmons
			Gonzalez (TX)	McKinley	Tipton
			Gooden	McNerney	Torres Small
			Gottheimer	Meadows	(NM)
			Granger	Meuser	Trone
			Graves (GA)	Miller	Turner
			Graves (LA)	Mitchell	Underwood
			Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Upton
			Green (TN)	Mooney (WV)	Van Drew
			Green, Al (TX)	Morelle	Vargas
			Guest	Murphy	Veasey
			Guthrie	Neal	Visclosky
			Hagedorn	Newhouse	Wagner
			Harder (CA)	Norman	Walberg
			Harris	Nunes	Walden
			Hartzler	O'Halleran	Walker
			Hayes	Olson	Waltz
			Heck	Palazzo	Wasserman
			Hern, Kevin	Pallone	Schultz
			Herrera Beutler	Palmer	Waters
			Hice (GA)	Panetta	Watkins
			Higgins (LA)	Pappas	Weber (TX)
			Hill (AR)	Pascrell	Webster (FL)
			Hill (CA)	Payne	Welch
			Himes	Pence	Wenstrup
			Holding	Perlmutter	Westerman
			Hollingsworth	Peters	Wexton
			Horn, Kendra S.	Peterson	Williams
			Horsford	Phillips	Wilson (SC)
			Houlahan	Pingree	Wittman
			Hoyer	Posey	Womack
			Hudson	Price (NC)	Woodall
			Huffman	Quigley	Wright
			Huizenga	Raskin	Yarmuth
			Hunter	Ratcliffe	Yoho
			Hurd (TX)	Reed	Young
			Jeffries	Reschenthaler	Zeldin
			Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)	

NAYS—85

Amash	Beyer	Blumenauer
Barragán	Biggs	Blunt Rochester

Bonamici	Gomez	Moore
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	Mucarsel-Powell
Brown (MD)	Griffith	Nadler
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Napolitano
Buck	Grothman	Neguse
Chu, Judy	Haaland	Norcross
Ciциline	Higgins (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez
Cisneros	Jackson Lee	Omar
Clark (MA)	Jayapal	Perry
Clarke (NY)	Jordan	Pocan
Cloud	Keating	Porter
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Pressley
Connolly	Kennedy	Roy
DeFazio	Khanna	Ruiz
DeGette	Lawrence	Schakowsky
Delgado	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
DeSaulniers	Levin (MI)	Soto
Dingell	Lewis	Takano
Doggett	Lofgren	Titus
Escobar	Lowenthal	Tlaib
Espallat	Lujan	Tonko
Frankel	Malinowski	Trahan
Gaetz	Maloney,	Vela
Gallego	Carolyn B.	Velázquez
Garcia (IL)	Massie	Watson Coleman
Garcia (TX)	Meeks	Wild
Gohmert	Meng	

NOT VOTING—25

Abraham	Lucas	Steube
Aderholt	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)
Castro (TX)	Mullin	Taylor
Gabbard	Richmond	Thornberry
Hastings	Rogers (AL)	Torres (CA)
Johnson (LA)	Rooney (FL)	Walorski
Kaptur	Ryan	Wilson (FL)
Kinzingler	Schrader	
Kustoff (TN)	Sensenbrenner	

□ 1609

Ms. WILD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, Messrs. HIGGINS of New York, TONKO, ESPAILLAT, COHEN, KEATING, NADLER, GOHMERT, LEWIS, MALINOWSKI, NORCROSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. DINGELL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GRAVES of Missouri, CARTER of Texas, CORREA, GOTTHEIMER, CARSON of Indiana, THOMPSON of Mississippi, JOHNSON of Ohio, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, BISHOP of Utah, and Ms. FUDGE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING MIGRANTS WHO HAVE DIED ATTEMPTING TO REACH THE SHORES OF THE UNITED STATES**

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

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, today I ask that we observe a moment of silence for the migrants who have died as they have tried to reach the shores of the America that they dream of.

The photograph that all of us saw this week should tear all of us up, for those of us who are parents, to see a toddler with her little arms wrapped around the neck of her father.

There is nothing that we wouldn't do for our children, nothing, to give them a better life.

Oscar and Valeria represent tens of thousands of migrants who have died

as they have tried to build a better life for themselves, only to find that they are demonized and locked out of the promise that those of us who are natural born citizens are so fortunate to enjoy.

In their name, let us never forget their sacrifice and the sacrifice that so many parents make for the most vulnerable among us.

□ 1615

**SECURING AMERICA'S FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2722) to protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure used to carry out such elections, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am in its current form.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2722 to the Committee on House Administration with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 72, insert after line 3 the following (and conform the succeeding provisions accordingly):

**TITLE IV—DISCLOSURE OF FOREIGN NATIONAL ACCESS TO ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE**

**SEC. 401. DISCLOSURE OF ACCESS TO ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.), as amended by section 121, is further amended by inserting after section 303A the following new section:

**“SEC. 303B. ACCESS TO ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each chief State election official shall disclose to the Commission the identity of any foreign national known by the chief State election official—

“(1) to have physically handled—

“(A) ballots used in an election for Federal office; or

“(B) voting machines; or

“(2) to have had unmonitored access to—

“(A) a storage facility or centralized vote tabulation location used to support the administration of an election for public office; or

“(B) election-related information or communications technology, including voter registration databases, voting machines, electronic mail and other communications systems (including electronic mail and other systems of vendors who have entered into

contracts with election agencies to support the administration of elections, manage the election process, and report and display election results), and other systems used to manage the election process and to report and display election results on behalf of an election agency.

“(b) TIMING.—The chief State election official shall make the disclosure under subsection (a) not later than 30 days after the date on which such official becomes aware of an activity described in such subsection.

“(c) FOREIGN NATIONAL DEFINED.—The term ‘foreign national’ has the meaning given that term in section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303A the following new item:

“Sec. 303B. Access to election infrastructure by foreign nationals.”

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit.

For months, we have heard about the interference in our elections and the report of Special Counsel Robert Mueller, this report right here. But nothing in this bill that we are debating today and voting on today before this body now addresses the concerns that have been raised in this report.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in the bill we are debating today addresses the concerns of foreign interference raised in the special counsel's report that I am holding right now. What we know is that Russia attempted to interfere in our 2016 election through a misinformation campaign, email hacking, and by exploring vulnerabilities of registration databases. This is gravely concerning to every Republican and Democrat in this institution.

But what does the Federal Government telling States that they must replace their safe, new, and auditable machines have to do with addressing these concerns? What does a hand recount mandate have to do with these concerns? What does recycled paper have to do with these concerns?

The tremendous costs associated with these Federal mandates only serve to draw resources away from the real vulnerabilities our States face.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have also represented that Republicans have done nothing to address foreign interference in our elections, and that, Mr. Speaker, is simply not true.

In 2017, this country's election infrastructure was designated as critical infrastructure, thereby allowing the Department of Homeland Security to immediately begin offering voluntary assistance to State and local election officials in the form of cybersecurity advisers, assessments, threat detection and prevention tools, information sharing, and incident response.

Additionally, the 115th Congress, last Congress, a Republican-controlled Congress, appropriated \$380 million to States prior to the 2018 midterms to bolster election security and \$26 million to DHS to add additional staff and carry out their assessment efforts, allowing for unprecedented cooperation between DHS and all 50 States and 1,400 localities in 2018.

Earlier this year, \$33 million was appropriated to DHS to continue these assistance efforts, and earlier this week, the Republicans, my fellow Republicans, Mr. WALKER and Mr. LOUDERMILK, on the House Administration Committee, introduced our own Election Security Assistance Act.

So don't tell me we are not taking this seriously.

While so much of the focus has been on foreign interference today, we must not forget that we had a Member not seated this Congress following evidence that political operatives illegally harvested unsealed and only partially filled-out ballots. This practice is legal in many States, but as we have seen, it is ripe for fraud and abuse.

Republicans have offered multiple amendments to prohibit this practice in H.R. 1 and, now, the SAFE Act, each failing on a party-line vote. If we can't agree that this fraudulent practice should be banned, let us at least agree that foreign nationals should not be harvesting the ballots of American citizens.

Right now, a Russian operative could walk freely around States like California, for example, collecting and turning in absentee ballots, completely altering the outcome of an election. But my colleagues have shown no interest in addressing this huge vulnerability simply because it serves their interest only in certain States.

This practice invites a constitutional crisis. America, Mr. Speaker, is watching this vote right now. My amendment today would require the chief election official of each State to disclose to the Election Assistance Commission the identity of any known foreign national who has physically handled ballots, machines, or has had unmonitored access to the storage facilities or tabulation centers used to support elections, or even unmonitored access to election-related information or communication technology. This takes an additional step in rooting out foreign interference and lets the process of legislating about election security finally begin.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit. Vote to protect our elections from interference from

foreign countries like Russia, China, and all others. Vote to preserve the integrity of our ballot, and vote to restore the American people's trust in our institutions.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make an important observation. The gentleman has said that what happened in North Carolina is perfectly legal in other States. Fraud is not legal in any of the 50 States.

I would like to note that, in our bill, we do have provisions that vendors must be owned and controlled by citizens or permanent residents of the United States and certain other provisions relative to security; but to conflate the allowance in some States—of 27 States and 9 others that designate allowing your mother or your brother or your neighbor to take your ballot with fraud is really pretty low.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

In our democracy, we should actively be seeking ways to involve more people rather than shutting them out of the process. Some States have done this by making voting accessible for homebound voters and others who have trouble physically getting to the polls and allowing an absentee voter to designate anyone of their choosing to drop off a marked ballot. This policy allows for greater participation in elections because some homebound voters have no family or individuals to delegate that role to. They should not be disenfranchised by our laws.

Ballot drop-off laws are, in and of themselves, perfectly appropriate election administration laws. If your aunt or uncle is a physician of an H1B visa holder, if you are working a double shift and you hand your ballot to someone who is a Dreamer, if you are married to an individual with TPS status, this would require you to report that individual to the Federal Government.

The House Administration Committee is already reviewing the foreign influence on American elections as the chairwoman mentioned, and we welcome the minority working with us in this regard. We know, from a Washington Post story published earlier this year, in which Members here in this Chamber are quoted as developing a strategy to engage in that practice themselves.

In fact, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle were quoted as being

laser focused on ballot collection in the 2020 elections. So they will have to forgive me if I don't buy into the argument they are making today that their favorite examples of potential problems with the system are actions of a political operative on behalf of a Republican candidate who illegally changed and threw away ballots.

This is a suppression tactic. It is the height of hypocrisy that our Republican colleagues would be creating a new Federal standard after this entire debate they had been railing against the same. They will forgive us if we feel that that is a little disingenuous.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would close by urging every Member to vote against this motion to recommit and further note that the House Administration Committee will soon be examining foreign influence on our elections. We would welcome the participation of the minority in that important work.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 220, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

AYES—189

Aderholt	Chabot	Fulcher
Allen	Cheney	Gaetz
Amodei	Cline	Gallagher
Armstrong	Cloud	Gianforte
Arrington	Cole	Gibbs
Axne	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Babin	Collins (NY)	Gonzalez (OH)
Bacon	Comer	Gooden
Baird	Conaway	Gosar
Balderson	Cook	Granger
Banks	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Barr	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Bergman	Cunningham	Graves (MO)
Biggs	Curtis	Green (TN)
Bilirakis	Davidson (OH)	Griffith
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Grothman
Bost	DesJarlais	Guest
Brady	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Hagedorn
Brooks (IN)	Duncan	Harris
Buchanan	Dunn	Hartzler
Buck	Emmer	Hern, Kevin
Bucshon	Estes	Herrera Beutler
Budd	Ferguson	Hice (GA)
Burchett	Finkenauer	Higgins (LA)
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	Hill (AR)
Byrne	Fleischmann	Holding
Calvert	Flores	Hollingsworth
Carter (GA)	Fortenberry	Hudson
Carter (TX)	Foxx (NC)	Huizenga



Hunter Mitchell  
 Hurd (TX) Moolenaar  
 Johnson (OH) Mooney (WV)  
 Johnson (SD) Newhouse  
 Jordan Norman  
 Joyce (OH) Nunes  
 Joyce (PA) Olson  
 Katko Palazzo  
 Keller Palmer  
 Kelly (MS) Pence  
 Kelly (PA) Perry  
 King (IA) Posey  
 King (NY) Ratcliffe  
 LaHood Reed  
 LaMalfa Reschenthaler  
 Lamborn Rice (SC)  
 Latta Riggleman  
 Lesko Roby  
 Long Rodgers (WA)  
 Loudermilk Roe, David P.  
 Luetkemeyer Rogers (KY)  
 Marchant Rose, John W.  
 Marshall Rouzer  
 Mast Roy  
 McAdams Rutherford  
 McCarthy Scalise  
 McCaul Schweikert  
 McClintock Scott, Austin  
 McHenry Shimkus  
 McKinley Simpson  
 Meadows Smith (MO)  
 Meuser Smith (NE)  
 Miller Smith (NJ)

NOES—220

Adams Escobar  
 Aguilar Eshoo  
 Allred Espaillat  
 Amash Evans  
 Barragán Fletcher  
 Bass Foster  
 Beatty Frankel  
 Bera Fudge  
 Beyer Gallego  
 Bishop (GA) Garamendi  
 Blumenauer García (IL)  
 Blunt Rochester García (TX)  
 Bonamici Golden  
 Boyle, Brendan Gomez  
 F. Gonzalez (TX)  
 Brindisi Gottheimer  
 Brown (MD) Green, Al (TX)  
 Brownley (CA) Grijalva  
 Bustos Haaland  
 Butterfield Harder (CA)  
 Carbajal Hayes  
 Cárdenas Heck  
 Carson (IN) Higgins (NY)  
 Cartwright Hill (CA)  
 Case Himes  
 Casten (IL) Horn, Kendra S.  
 Castor (FL) Horsford  
 Chu, Judy Houlihan  
 Cicilline Hoyer  
 Cisneros Huffman  
 Clark (MA) Jackson Lee  
 Clarke (NY) Jayapal  
 Clay Jeffries  
 Cleaver Johnson (GA)  
 Clyburn Johnson (TX)  
 Cohen Keating  
 Connolly Kelly (IL)  
 Cooper Kennedy  
 Correa Khanna  
 Costa Kildee  
 Courtney Kilmer  
 Cox (CA) Kim  
 Craig Kind  
 Crist Kirkpatrick  
 Crow Krishnamoorthi  
 Cuellar Kuster (NH)  
 Cummings Lamb  
 Davids (KS) Langevin  
 Davis (CA) Larsen (WA)  
 Davis, Danny K. Larson (CT)  
 Dean Lawrence  
 DeFazio Lawson (FL)  
 DeGette Lee (CA)  
 DeLauro Lee (NV)  
 DelBene Levin (CA)  
 Delgado Levin (MI)  
 Demings Lewis  
 DeSaulnier Lieu, Ted  
 Deutch Lipinski  
 Dingell Loeb sack  
 Doggett Lofgren  
 Doyle, Michael Lowenthal  
 F. Lowey  
 Engel Luján

Smucker  
 Spanberger  
 Spano  
 Stauber  
 Stefanik  
 Steil  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Taylor  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Timmons  
 Tipton  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Van Drew  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Waltz  
 Watkins  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Wright  
 Yoho  
 Zeldin

Sires  
 Slotkin  
 Smith (WA)  
 Soto  
 Speier  
 Stanton  
 Stevens  
 Suozzi  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)

Abraham  
 Castro (TX)  
 Gabbard  
 Hastings  
 Johnson (LA)  
 Kaptur  
 Kinzinger  
 Kustoff (TN)

Titus  
 Tlaib  
 Tonko  
 Torres (CA)  
 Torres Small  
 (NM)  
 Trahan  
 Trone  
 Underwood  
 Vargas  
 Veasey

NOT VOTING—23

Lucas  
 Moulton  
 Mullin  
 Richmond  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rooney (FL)  
 Ryan  
 Schrader

Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wexton  
 Wild  
 Yarmuth

McAdams  
 McBath  
 McCollum  
 McEachin  
 McGovern  
 McNerney  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Morelle  
 Mucarsel-Powell  
 Murphy  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Neguse  
 Norcross  
 O'Halleran  
 Ocasio-Cortez  
 Omar  
 Pallone  
 Panetta  
 Pappas  
 Pascrell  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Phillips  
 Pingree  
 Pocan

Porter  
 Pressley  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Raskin  
 Rice (NY)  
 Rose (NY)  
 Rouda  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Sánchez  
 Sarbanes  
 Scanlon  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Schrier  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Shalala  
 Sherman  
 Sherrill  
 Sires  
 Slotkin  
 Smith (WA)  
 Soto  
 Spanberger

Speier  
 Stanton  
 Stevens  
 Suozzi  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tlaib  
 Tonko  
 Torres (CA)  
 Torres Small  
 (NM)  
 Trahan  
 Trone  
 Underwood  
 Van Drew  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wexton  
 Wild  
 Yarmuth

NOES—184

Mr. ROY changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 184, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

AYES—225

Adams Cummings  
 Aguilar Cunningham  
 Alford Davids (KS)  
 Axne Davis (CA)  
 Barragán Davis, Danny K.  
 Bass Dean  
 Beatty DeFazio  
 Bera DeGette  
 Beyer DeLauro  
 Bishop (GA) DelBene  
 Blumenauer Delgado  
 Blunt Rochester Demings  
 Bonamici DeSaulnier  
 Boyle, Brendan Deutch  
 F. Dingell  
 Brindisi Doggett  
 Brown (MD) Doyle, Michael  
 F. F.  
 Brownley (CA) Engel  
 Bustos Escobar  
 Butterfield Eshoo  
 Carbajal Españat  
 Cárdenas Evans  
 Carson (IN) Finkenauer  
 Cartwright Case  
 Case Fletcher  
 Casten (IL) Foster  
 Castor (FL) Frankel  
 Chu, Judy Fudge  
 Cicilline Gallego  
 Cisneros Garamendi  
 Clark (MA) García (IL)  
 Clarke (NY) García (TX)  
 Clay Golden  
 Cleaver Gomez  
 Clyburn Gonzalez (TX)  
 Cohen Gottheimer  
 Connolly Green, Al (TX)  
 Cooper Grijalva  
 Correa Haaland  
 Costa Harder (CA)  
 Courtney Hayes  
 Cox (CA) Heck  
 Craig Higgins (NY)  
 Crist Hill (CA)  
 Doyle, Michael Himes  
 F. Lowey  
 Engel Horn, Kendra S.

Horsford  
 Houlihan  
 Hoyer  
 Huffman  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jayapal  
 Jeffries  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (TX)  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kennedy  
 Khanna  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kim  
 Kind  
 Kirkpatrick  
 Krishnamoorthi  
 Kuster (NH)  
 Lamb  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lawrence  
 Lawson (FL)  
 Lee (CA)  
 Lee (NV)  
 Levin (CA)  
 Levin (MI)  
 Lewis  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Luján  
 Luria  
 Lynch  
 Malinowski  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn B.  
 Mast  
 Matsui

Aderholt  
 Allen  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Armstrong  
 Arrington  
 Babin  
 Bacon  
 Baird  
 Balderson  
 Banks  
 Barr  
 Bergman  
 Biggs  
 Billirakis  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Bost  
 Brady  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Buchanan  
 Buck  
 Bucshon  
 Budd  
 Burchett  
 Burgess  
 Byrnes  
 Calvert  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Cheney  
 Cline  
 Cloud  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comer  
 Conaway  
 Cook  
 Crawford  
 Crenshaw  
 Curtis  
 Davidson (OH)  
 Davis, Rodney  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Duffy  
 Duncan  
 Dunn  
 Emmer  
 Estes  
 Ferguson  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Flores  
 Fortenberry  
 Foyx (NC)  
 Fulcher  
 Gaetz  
 Gallagher  
 Gianforte

Gibbs  
 Gohmert  
 Gonzalez (OH)  
 Gooden  
 Gosar  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Green (TN)  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guest  
 Guthrie  
 Hagedorn  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hern, Kevin  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice (GA)  
 Higgins (LA)  
 Hill (AR)  
 Holding  
 Hollingsworth  
 Hudson  
 Huizenga  
 Hunter  
 Hurd (TX)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson (SD)  
 Jordan  
 Joyce (OH)  
 Joyce (PA)  
 Katko  
 Keller  
 Kelly (MS)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 King (NY)  
 LaHood  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Latta  
 Lesko  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Marchant  
 Marshall  
 Massie  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 Meadows  
 Meuser  
 Miller  
 Mitchell  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Newhouse

Norman  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Palmer  
 Pence  
 Perry  
 Posey  
 Ratcliffe  
 Reed  
 Reschenthaler  
 Rice (SC)  
 Guest  
 Rigglesman  
 Roby  
 Rodgers (WA)  
 Roe, David P.  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rose, John W.  
 Rouzer  
 Roy  
 Rutherford  
 Scalise  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Shimkus  
 Simpson  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smucker  
 Spano  
 Stauber  
 Stefanik  
 Steil  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Taylor  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Timmons  
 Tipton  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Waltz  
 Watkins  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Wright  
 Yoho  
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—23

Abraham  
 Castro (TX)

Gabbard  
 Hastings

Johnson (LA)  
 Kaptur

Kinzinger	Rogers (AL)	Swalwell (CA)
Kustoff (TN)	Rooney (FL)	Thornberry
Lucas	Ryan	Walorski
Moulton	Schradler	Wilson (FL)
Mullin	Sensenbrenner	Young
Richmond	Steube	

□ 1641

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SECURITY AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER ACT, 2019

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 466, I call up the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

*That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, namely:*

#### TITLE I

##### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

###### GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

###### EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW

For an additional amount for “Executive Office for Immigration Review”, \$65,000,000, of which \$45,000,000 shall be for the hiring of 30 additional Immigration Judge Teams, of which \$10,000,000 shall be used for the purchase or lease of immigration judge courtroom space and equipment, and of which \$10,000,000 shall be used only for services and activities provided by the Legal Orientation Program: Provided, That Immigration Judge Teams shall include appropriate attorneys, law clerks, paralegals, court administrators, and other support staff: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

###### UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

###### FEDERAL PRISONER DETENTION

For an additional amount for “Federal Prisoner Detention”, for necessary expenses related to United States prisoners in the custody of the United States Marshals Service, to be used only as authorized by section 4013 of title 18, United States Code, \$155,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

#### TITLE II

##### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

###### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

###### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army”, \$92,800,000, for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied minors and family unit aliens at

the southwest border and related activities: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

###### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”, \$13,025,000, for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied minors and family unit aliens at the southwest border and related activities: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

###### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, \$18,000,000, for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied minors and family unit aliens at the southwest border and related activities: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

###### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard”, \$21,024,000, for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied minors and family unit aliens at the southwest border and related activities: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

#### TITLE III

##### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

###### U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

###### OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT

For an additional amount for “Operations and Support” for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in aliens at the southwest border and related activities, \$1,015,431,000; of which \$819,950,000 shall be available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That of the amounts provided under this heading, \$708,000,000 is for establishing and operating migrant care and processing facilities, \$111,950,000 is for consumables and medical care, \$35,000,000 is for transportation, \$110,481,000 is for temporary duty and overtime costs including reimbursements, and \$50,000,000 is for mission support data systems and analysis: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

###### PROCUREMENT, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Construction, and Improvements” for migrant care and processing facilities, \$85,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

##### U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

###### OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT

For an additional amount for “Operations and Support” for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in aliens at the southwest border and related activities, \$208,945,000: Provided, That of the amounts provided under this heading, \$35,943,000 is for transportation of unaccompanied alien children, \$11,981,000 is for detainee transportation for medical needs, court proceedings, or relocation from U.S. Customs

and Border Protection custody, \$20,000,000 is for alternatives to detention, \$45,000,000 is for detainee medical care, \$69,735,000 is for temporary duty, overtime, and other on-board personnel costs including reimbursements, \$5,000,000 is for the Office of Professional Responsibility for background investigations and facility inspections, and \$21,286,000 is for Homeland Security Investigations human trafficking investigations: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

##### FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

###### FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for “Federal Assistance”, \$30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, for the emergency food and shelter program under title III of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11331 et seq.) for the purposes of providing assistance to aliens released from the custody of the Department of Homeland Security: Provided, That notwithstanding sections 315 and 316(b) of such Act, funds made available under this section shall be disbursed by the Emergency Food and Shelter Program National Board not later than 30 days after the date on which such funds become available: Provided further, That the Emergency Food and Shelter Program National Board shall distribute such funds only to jurisdictions or local recipient organizations serving communities that have experienced a significant influx of such aliens: Provided further, That such funds may be used to reimburse such jurisdictions or local recipient organizations for costs incurred in providing services to such aliens on or after January 1, 2019: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

##### GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 301. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available under each heading in this title shall only be used for the purposes specifically described under that heading.

SEC. 302. Division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-6) is amended by adding after section 540 the following:

“SEC. 541. (a) Section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall be applied—

“(1) In subsection (a), by substituting ‘September 30, 2019,’ for ‘September 30, 2017,’; and

“(2) In subsection (c)(1), by substituting ‘September 30, 2019,’ for ‘September 30, 2017.’

“(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security, under the authority of section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391(a)), may carry out prototype projects under section 2371b of title 10, United States Code, and the Secretary shall perform the functions of the Secretary of Defense as prescribed.

“(c) The Secretary of Homeland Security under section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391(d)) may use the definition of nontraditional government contractor as defined in section 2371b(e) of title 10, United States Code.”

SEC. 303. None of the funds provided in this Act under “U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Operations and Support” for facilities shall be available until U.S. Customs and Border Protection establishes policies (via directive, procedures, guidance, and/or memorandum) and training programs to ensure that such facilities adhere to the National Standards on Transport, Escort, Detention, and Search, published in October of 2015: Provided, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall provide a detailed report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of

Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the House Judiciary Committee regarding the establishment and implementation of such policies and training programs.

SEC. 304. No later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a report on the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers assigned to northern border land ports of entry and temporarily assigned to the ongoing humanitarian crisis: Provided, That the report shall outline what resources and conditions would allow a return to northern border staffing levels that are no less than the number committed in the June 12, 2018 Department of Homeland Security Northern Border Strategy: Provided further, That the report shall include the number of officers temporarily assigned to the southwest border in response to the ongoing humanitarian crisis, the number of days the officers will be away from their northern border assignment, the northern border ports from which officers are being assigned to the southwest border, and efforts being made to limit the impact on operations at each northern border land port of entry where officers have been temporarily assigned to the southwest border.

SEC. 305. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-6) for the Department of Homeland Security may be used to relocate to the National Targeting Center the vetting of Trusted Traveler Program applications and operations currently carried out at existing locations unless specifically authorized by a statute enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 306. The personnel, supplies, or equipment of any component of the Department of Homeland Security may be deployed to support activities of the Department of Homeland Security related to the significant rise in aliens at the southwest border and related activities, and for the enforcement of immigration and customs laws, detention and removals of aliens crossing the border unlawfully, and investigations without reimbursement as jointly agreed by the detailing components.

#### TITLE IV

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

#### ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for “Refugee and Entrant Assistance”, \$2,881,552,000, to be merged with and available for the same period as funds appropriated in Public Law 115-245 “for carrying out such sections 414, 501, 462, and 235”, which shall be available for any purpose funded under such heading in such law: Provided, That if any part of the reprogramming described in the notification submitted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (the “Secretary”) to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on May 16, 2019 has been executed, such amounts provided by this Act as are necessary shall be used to reverse such reprogramming: Provided further, That amounts allocated by the Secretary for costs of leases of property that include facilities to be used as hard-sided dormitories for which the Secretary intends to seek State licensure for the care of unaccompanied alien children, and that are executed under authorities transferred to the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) under section 462 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That ORR shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 72 hours of conducting a formal assessment of a facility for possible lease or acquisition and within 7 days of any acquisition or lease of real property: Provided further, That not less than \$866,000,000 of

amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the provision of care in licensed shelters and for expanding the supply of shelters for which State licensure will be sought, of which not less than \$27,000,000 shall be available for the purposes of adding shelter beds in State-licensed facilities in response to funding opportunity HHS-2017-ACF-ORR-ZU-1132, and of which not less than \$185,000,000 shall be available for expansion grants to add beds in State-licensed facilities and open new State-licensed facilities, and for contract costs to acquire, activate, and operate facilities that will include small- and medium-scale hard-sided facilities for which the Secretary intends to seek State licensure in an effort to phase out the need for shelter beds in unlicensed facilities: Provided further, That not less than \$100,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for post-release services, child advocates, and legal services: Provided further, That not less than \$8,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the purposes of hiring additional Federal Field Specialists and for increasing case management and case coordination services, with the goal of more expeditiously placing unaccompanied alien children with sponsors and reducing the length of stay in ORR custody: Provided further, That not less than \$1,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the purposes of hiring project officers and program monitor staff dedicated to pursuing strategic improvements to the Unaccompanied Alien Children program and for the development of a discharge rate improvement plan which shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 120 days of enactment of this Act: Provided further, That of the amounts provided under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall be transferred to “Office of the Secretary—Office of Inspector General” and shall remain available until expended for oversight of activities supported with funds appropriated under this heading: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Health and Human Services (the “Secretary”) shall prioritize use of community-based residential care (including long-term and transitional foster care and small group homes) and shelter care other than large-scale institutional shelter facilities to house unaccompanied alien children in its custody. The Secretary shall prioritize State-licensed and hard-sided dormitories.

SEC. 402. The Office of Refugee Resettlement shall ensure that its grantees and, to the greatest extent practicable, potential sponsors of unaccompanied alien children are aware of current law regarding the use of information collected as part of the sponsor suitability determination process.

SEC. 403. (a) None of the funds provided by this or any prior appropriations Act may be used to reverse changes in procedures made by operational directives issued to providers by the Office of Refugee Resettlement on December 18, 2018, March 23, 2019, and June 10, 2019 regarding the Memorandum of Agreement on Information Sharing executed April 13, 2018.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary may make changes to such operational directives upon making a determination that such changes are necessary to prevent unaccompanied alien children from being placed in danger, and the Secretary shall provide a written justification to Congress and the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services in advance of implementing such changes.

(c) Within 15 days of the Secretary’s communication of the justification, the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human

Services shall provide an assessment, in writing, to the Secretary and to Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of whether such changes to operational directives are necessary to prevent unaccompanied children from being placed in danger.

SEC. 404. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance” may be obligated to a grantee or contractor to house unaccompanied alien children (as such term is defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2))) in any facility that is not State-licensed for the care of unaccompanied alien children, except in the case that the Secretary determines that housing unaccompanied alien children in such a facility is necessary on a temporary basis due to an influx of such children or an emergency, provided that—

(1) the terms of the grant or contract for the operations of any such facility that remains in operation for more than six consecutive months shall require compliance with—

(A) the same requirements as licensed placements, as listed in Exhibit 1 of the Flores Settlement Agreement that the Secretary determines are applicable to non-State licensed facilities; and

(B) staffing ratios of one (1) on-duty Youth Care Worker for every eight (8) children or youth during waking hours, one (1) on-duty Youth Care Worker for every sixteen (16) children or youth during sleeping hours, and clinician ratios to children (including mental health providers) as required in grantee cooperative agreements;

(2) the Secretary may grant a 60-day waiver for a contractor’s or grantee’s non-compliance with paragraph (1) if the Secretary certifies and provides a report to Congress on the contractor’s or grantee’s good-faith efforts and progress towards compliance;

(3) not more than four consecutive waivers under paragraph (2) may be granted to a contractor or grantee with respect to a specific facility;

(4) ORR shall ensure full adherence to the monitoring requirements set forth in section 5.5 of its Policies and Procedures Guide as of May 15, 2019;

(5) for any such unlicensed facility in operation for more than three consecutive months, ORR shall conduct a minimum of one comprehensive monitoring visit during the first three months of operation, with quarterly monitoring visits thereafter; and

(6) not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, ORR shall brief the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate outlining the requirements of ORR for influx facilities including any requirement listed in paragraph (1)(A) that the Secretary has determined are not applicable to non-State licensed facilities.

SEC. 405. In addition to the existing Congressional notification for formal site assessments of potential influx facilities, the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at least 15 days before operationalizing an unlicensed facility, and shall (1) specify whether the facility is hard-sided or soft-sided, and (2) provide analysis that indicates that, in the absence of the influx facility, the likely outcome is that unaccompanied alien children will remain in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security for longer than 72 hours or that unaccompanied alien children will be otherwise placed in danger. Within 60 days of bringing such a facility online, and monthly thereafter, the Secretary shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report detailing the total number of children in care at the facility, the average length of stay and average length of care of

children at the facility, and, for any child that has been at the facility for more than 60 days, their length of stay and reason for delay in release.

SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary shall ensure that, when feasible, no unaccompanied alien child is at an unlicensed facility if the child—

- (1) is not expected to be placed with a sponsor within 30 days;
- (2) is under the age of 13;
- (3) does not speak English or Spanish as his or her preferred language;
- (4) has known special needs, behavioral health issues, or medical issues that would be better served at an alternative facility;
- (5) is a pregnant or parenting teen; or
- (6) would have a diminution of legal services as a result of the transfer to such an unlicensed facility.

(b) ORR shall notify a child's attorney of record in advance of any transfer, where applicable.

SEC. 407. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to prevent a United States Senator or Member of the House of Representatives from entering, for the purpose of conducting oversight, any facility in the United States used for the purpose of maintaining custody of, or otherwise housing, unaccompanied alien children (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2))), provided that such Senator or Member has coordinated the oversight visit with the Office of Refugee Resettlement not less than two business days in advance to ensure that such visit would not interfere with the operations (including child welfare and child safety operations) of such facility.

SEC. 408. Not later than 14 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and monthly thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and make publicly available online, a report with respect to children who were separated from their parents or legal guardians by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (regardless of whether or not such separation was pursuant to an option selected by the children, parents, or guardians), subsequently classified as unaccompanied alien children, and transferred to the care and custody of ORR during the previous month. Each report shall contain the following information:

- (1) the number and ages of children so separated subsequent to apprehension at or between ports of entry, to be reported by sector where separation occurred; and
- (2) the documented cause of separation, as reported by DHS when each child was referred.

SEC. 409. Funds made available in this Act under the heading "Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance" shall be subject to the authorities and conditions of section 224 of division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-6).

SEC. 410. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed spend plan of anticipated uses of funds made available in this account, including the following: a list of existing grants and contracts for both permanent and influx facilities, including their costs, capacity, and timelines; costs for expanding capacity through the use of community-based residential care placements (including long-term and transitional foster care and small group homes) through new or modified grants and contracts; current and planned efforts to expand small-scale shelters and available foster care placements, including collaboration with state child welfare providers; influx facilities being assessed for possible use, costs and services to be provided for legal services, child advocates, and post release services; program administration; and the average number of

weekly referrals and discharge rate assumed in the spend plan: Provided, That such plan shall be updated to reflect changes and expenditures and submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate every 60 days until all funds are expended or expired.

#### TITLE V

##### GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 501. Each amount appropriated or made available by this Act is in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 502. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 503. Unless otherwise provided for by this Act, the additional amounts appropriated by this Act to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2019.

SEC. 504. Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available (or rescinded or transferred, if applicable) only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

SEC. 505. Any amount appropriated by this Act, designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and subsequently so designated by the President, and transferred pursuant to transfer authorities provided by this Act shall retain such designation.

SEC. 506. Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the number of asylum officers and immigration judges, including temporary immigration judges, and the corresponding number of support staff necessary—

- (1) to fairly and effectively make credible fear determinations with respect to individuals within family units and unaccompanied alien children;
- (2) to ensure that the credible fear determination and asylum interview is completed not later than 20 days after the date on which a family unit is apprehended; and
- (3) to fairly and effectively review appeals of credible fear determinations with respect to individuals within family units and unaccompanied alien children.

In addition, the report shall determine if there is any physical infrastructure such as hearing or courtroom space needed to achieve these goals.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019".

#### MOTION TO CONCUR

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mrs. Lowey moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3401.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentlewoman

from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

□ 1645

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the motion currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairwoman for yielding and admire her for her distinguished and hard work to bring a solution to the floor. This is not the one that we had hoped for, but it is one that we will be voting on today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank NITA LOWEY, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, Congresswoman ROSA DELAUNO, and all of the appropriators for their relentless good faith work on a strong bill that we had hoped would completely protect vulnerable children, keep America safe, and honor our values.

Today, sadly, and almost with a broken heart, those values are being undermined by failed policies which have intensified a situation of heartbreak and horror on the border, all of which challenges the conscience of America.

I will be brief in just saying, right now, children need their families. Right now, little children are enduring trauma and terror; many are living in squalor at the border station, patrol station; some are sleeping on the cold ground without warm blankets or hot meals.

Kids as young as 7 and 8 years old are watching over infants because no one else is there to care for them. As one little girl caring for two infants said: I need comfort, too. I am bigger than they are, but I am a child, too.

Mr. Speaker, we could have done so much better—so much better—than what we are faced with today. It is my belief, my colleagues, that our country is at a moment of truth in acting upon our values as we develop policies.

I am proud of the work that our appropriators in the House have done in passing a bill that received overwhelming Democratic support on Tuesday. It was even bipartisan.

The current situation on the border is shameful and does not reflect America's values. We don't need anyone—especially the United States Senate—to tell us what the needs are on the border and that we have to act expeditiously.

Our Members are very well versed and excellent representatives of the regions they represent and that are affected, but we want to find a path to

improve the conditions under which we are addressing and ministering to the needs of children and families there.

We are gravely disappointed in the actions taken by the Senate in opposing the regular order of the Congress of the United States. We will continue to fight for our values and priorities in our legislation and beyond.

Our strongest ally in getting a better policy than that which was passed by the Republican Senate is public opinion. And people and institutions of good faith in our country, our faith-based institutions who minister to the needs of our immigrants, know that this is not the best way to go. So as we go forward, we will continue to fight for our values with public opinion and faith-based organizations on our side.

The American people are constantly asking the question: Why aren't we doing a better job to respect the dignity and worth of our children? The dignity and worth of our children. The dignity and worth of our children.

That might amuse you, but it is not amusing to the children who are affected.

The children come first. At the end of the day, we have to make sure that the resources needed to protect the children are available. Therefore, we will not engage in the same disrespectful behavior that the Senate did in ignoring the House priorities.

In order to get resources to the children fastest, we will reluctantly put the Senate bill on the floor. As the Senate bill passes—when it does, if it does—it will not be the end of this debate. It will be the battle cry. It will be the battle cry as to how we go forward to protect children in a way that truly honors their dignity and worth, their spark of divinity that they are all children of God.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR), our colleague, for the beautiful moment of silence that she held earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their leadership to protect values, honor our values, keep America safe. As always, with every vote, it is a vote of conscience.

The situation at the border is a challenge to the conscience of America. It should be a challenge to the conscience of each and every one of us. As always, you must vote your conscience.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, the humanitarian situation at our southern border is disgraceful. The Trump administration has exacerbated a crisis that has led to intolerable conditions for children and families in the government's care.

We have been advised that agencies that provide critical services for children, including the Office of Refugee Resettlement and Customs and Border Protection, will imminently run out of funds.

Earlier this week, the House passed a comprehensive bill to fund these agencies and provide important reforms to ensure that children in our govern-

ment's care are safe, healthy, and comfortable.

Sadly, the White House, which has done so much to create this crisis, refused to work with us to protect the children; and the Senate majority leader, who I am told is selling T-shirts that describe him as the Grim Reaper, refuses to respect the House as a co-equal body of Congress and negotiate the differences in our legislation.

Left in the lurch by this cruelty and callousness are the babies and children in government care. The House refuses to be a party to this cruelty. That is why we are reluctantly bringing the Senate legislation to the floor today.

We could have done better for our children and our families, but, unfortunately, the White House and the Senate would not allow that. So we will fight another day, and we will never stop fighting to protect the children who are our future.

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

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

I rise in very strong support of H.R. 3401, as amended by the Senate.

Hundreds of thousands of people have arrived at our border this year. More than 100,000 have crossed each of the last 3 months, with 144,000 in May alone. Some of these people are coming through points of entry, but the overwhelming majority are walking through the desert or swimming the Rio Grande.

Men and women across agencies and departments have been working together night and day trying to respond to the overwhelming surge, and they desperately need resources to cover the growing costs. This is a real crisis, and this bill provides funds for all those who are representing us and working without adequate pay.

As I said just yesterday, we are out of time. Some of our agencies are spending money they don't have because they have must-pay bills for contracts for food, for shelter, for transportation, and for medical care.

People are waiting in terrible conditions in the desert, and summer in Texas is here. Children are sleeping on the ground and need to be moved to shelters or homes. We need doctors and pediatricians and caregivers.

This bill gives the agencies the funds to care for these children, to reduce the overcrowding at border facilities, to repay the States, and to add immigration judge teams.

The Senate has already passed this bill on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis. Now we should do the same and send this bill to the President for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong "yes" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion to concur.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to concur will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 305, noes 102, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—305

Aderholt	DesJarlais	Kelly (IL)
Allen	Deutch	Kelly (MS)
Allred	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)
Amodei	Doyle, Michael	Kildee
Armstrong	F.	Kilmer
Arrington	Duffy	Kim
Axne	Duncan	Kind
Babin	Dunn	King (IA)
Bacon	Eshoo	King (NY)
Baird	Estes	Kirkpatrick
Balderson	Ferguson	Krishnamoorthi
Banks	Finkenauer	Kuster (NH)
Barr	Fitzpatrick	LaHood
Beatty	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Bera	Fletcher	Lamb
Bergman	Flores	Lamborn
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Langevin
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Fox (NC)	Larson (CT)
Blunt Rochester	Frankel	Latta
Bost	Fudge	Lawson (FL)
Brady	Fulcher	Lee (NV)
Brindisi	Gaetz	Lesko
Brooks (IN)	Gallagher	Levin (CA)
Brownley (CA)	Garamendi	Lipinski
Buchanan	Gianforte	Loeb
Bucshon	Gibbs	Long
Budd	Golden	Loudermilk
Burchett	Gonzalez (OH)	Luetkemeyer
Burgess	Gonzalez (TX)	Luria
Bustos	Gooden	Lynch
Byrne	Gottheimer	Malinowski
Calvert	Granger	Maloney, Sean
Carbajal	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Carter (TX)	Graves (LA)	Marshall
Cartwright	Graves (MO)	Mast
Case	Green (TN)	Matsui
Casten (IL)	Green, Al (TX)	McAdams
Castor (FL)	Griffith	McBath
Chabot	Grothman	McCarthy
Cheney	Guest	McCaul
Cleaver	Guthrie	McClintock
Cline	Hagedorn	McHenry
Cloud	Harder (CA)	McKinley
Clyburn	Harris	McNerney
Cohen	Hartzler	Meadows
Cole	Hayes	Meuser
Collins (GA)	Heck	Miller
Collins (NY)	Hern, Kevin	Mitchell
Comer	Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar
Conaway	Hice (GA)	Mooney (WV)
Cook	Higgins (LA)	Morelle
Cooper	Hill (AR)	Murphy
Costa	Himes	Neal
Courtney	Holding	Newhouse
Cox (CA)	Hollingsworth	Norman
Craig	Horn, Kendra S.	Nunes
Crawford	Houlihan	O'Halleran
Crenshaw	Hoyer	Olson
Crist	Hudson	Palazzo
Crow	Huizenga	Palmer
Cuellar	Hunter	Panetta
Cummings	Hurd (TX)	Pappas
Cunningham	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Curtis	Johnson (OH)	Perce
Davids (KS)	Johnson (SD)	Perlmutter
Davidson (OH)	Johnson (TX)	Perry
Davis (CA)	Jordan	Peters
Davis, Rodney	Joyce (OH)	Peterson
Dean	Joyce (PA)	Phillips
DelBene	Katko	Pingree
Delgado	Keating	Porter
Demings	Keller	Posey

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 159, nays 149, answered "present" 1, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

YEAS—159

Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Riggelman  
Roby  
Rodgers (WA)  
Roe, David P.  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose (NY)  
Rose, John W.  
Rouda  
Rouzer  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Rutherford  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrier  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)

Underwood  
Upton  
Van Drew  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Waltz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watkins  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Wright  
Yarmuth  
Yoho  
Zeldin

Herrera Beutler  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill (AR)  
Himes  
Holding  
Horn, Kendra S.  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hurd (TX)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (PA)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
LaHood  
Latta  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Luján  
Marchant  
Mast  
McAdams  
McBath  
McCaul

NOES—102

Adams  
Aguilar  
Amash  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beyer  
Biggs  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brooks (AL)  
Brown (MD)  
Butterfield  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Cisneros  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Connolly  
Correa  
Davis, Danny K.  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Engel  
Escobar  
Espallat  
Evans

Adams  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Axne  
Bacon  
Banks  
Barr  
Beatty  
Bergman  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blunt Rochester  
Bost  
Brady  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (TX)  
Case  
Roy  
Casten (IL)  
Castor (FL)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Luria  
Lynch  
Comer  
Cooper  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davids (KS)  
Davidson (OH)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Dean  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Demings  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Engel  
Escobar  
Espallat  
Evans  
Finkenauer  
Gallego

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tonko

NOT VOTING—123

Abraham  
Buck  
Carter (GA)  
Castro (TX)  
Emmer  
Gabbard  
Hastings  
Johnson (LA)  
Kaptur

Mucarsel-Powell  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neguse  
Norcross  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pocan  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Roy  
Roybal-Allard  
Sánchez  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Sherman  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Takanó  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Trahan  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Welch

Abraham  
Barragán  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blumenauer  
Brooks (AL)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Cartwright  
Castro (TX)  
Cheney  
Cisneros  
Cloud  
Cohen  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Costa  
Courtney  
Cox (CA)  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cunningham  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Duffy  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Eshoo  
Ferguson  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Frankel  
Gabbard  
Garamendi  
Gianforte  
Gohmert

NOT VOTING—25

□ 1717

Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. DELAURO and SPEIER, Messrs. SOTO and SHERMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MEADOWS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAYS—149

Aderholt  
Aguilar  
Allen  
Allred  
Amash  
Amodei  
Babin  
Baird  
Balderson  
Bass  
Bera  
Biggs  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brindisi  
Brooks (IN)  
Burchett  
Byrne  
Chabot  
Cline

□ 1724

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the following votes because I had to travel to my congressional district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall Vote No. 426, "no" on rollcall Vote No. 427, "yes" on rollcall Vote No. 428, "yes" on rollcall Vote No. 429, and "yes" on rollcall Vote No. 430.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 2500, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to file a supplemental report on the bill, H.R. 2500.

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

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2205

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have Representative BRIAN FITZPATRICK's name removed from H.R. 2205 as a cosponsor. His name was added inadvertently.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

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

#### HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LURIA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

#### HONORING 2018-2019 CHAMPIONS: HILLSIDE BASKETBALL ALL-STARS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend the Hillside Recreational Basketball All-Star

teams for their incredible successes this past season.

These young athletes and their coaches traveled all over the great State of New Jersey to compete in the New Jersey Basketball Association League.

The sixth and seventh grade athletes trained hard with their dedicated coaches which resulted in both teams winning 14 games. The teams then went on to win an additional four games during their championships. The seventh grade team maintained their 2-year champion streak.

These successes were accomplished thanks to each member's commitment to teamwork that allowed them to reach the height of their potential.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to say congratulations to the Hillside Basketball All-Stars.

□ 1730

#### RECOGNIZING RENA TURNER

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

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Representative Rena Turner for her years of service to North Carolina and in honor of her retirement from the North Carolina General Assembly.

Since 2013, Representative TURNER has been a tireless and effective advocate for Iredell County in the State legislature.

Rena has been effective as vice chair of the Appropriations Committee and also served on the Agriculture, Education, and Judiciary Committees.

In my view, she has been a champion for many economic sectors of our State but, in particular, agriculture, which she cared so much about.

Her constituents and I hate to see her go, but we take comfort in knowing that her family will get to spend some more time with her.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative Rena Turner for her many years of service to Iredell County and to our State, and I wish her nothing but the best in her retirement.

#### WE MUST AID THE HONDURAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of a U.S.-backed coup that, even now, hangs as a cudgel over the people of Honduras.

Ten years later, Hondurans still face an erosion of human rights amid unimagined violence, an unaccountable government, lack of opportunity, and increasingly militarized internal security forces.

Just last week, in response to civilian protests, President Hernandez de-

ployed the armed forces to quell his critics, a response that not only is recent, but reoccurring.

When you hear horrific accounts of violence and lawlessness in Honduras, it is no wonder so many seek a better life in America.

Ten years after the coup, we must own up to our role in the upheaval in Honduras and come to the aid of the people of Honduras.

#### HONORING NEBRASKA STATE TROOPER JERRY SMITH

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Nebraska State Trooper Jerry Smith. Jerry was killed last week in a tragic accident while on duty.

Jerry dedicated his life to serving. First, he served our Nation in the Army, where he won a Bronze Star. After his retirement from the Army, he served our great State with the Nebraska State Patrol.

He was highly respected in our community of Scottsbluff and Gering, Nebraska, and we grieve with his family.

His memorial service today was a testament to how many lives he touched and a tribute to his service. People from all around the State, and even law enforcement from out of State, joined together to pay their respects to Jerry.

He is survived by his wife, Karen, their children, and their grandchildren. Our hearts go out to them during this time, and they can be assured the entire State of Nebraska is with them.

We thank Jerry for his service to our State and remember him for his service as well.

#### GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Gun Violence Awareness Month and to honor the hundreds of thousands of survivors and victims of gun violence.

In 2018, in my city of Philadelphia, there were 351 homicides, and most of these were committed with a gun. What is happening in Philly is consistent with what is happening every day in violence-plagued Black and Brown communities across this country. It is sickening. So is the Senate's lack of action on commonsense gun reform bills that the House has passed.

While we still need commonsense gun reform, Senator CASEY and I have also introduced a bill that Members from both parties should be able to agree on, H.R. 2585, the Resources for Victims of Gun Violence Act.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join the 50 cosponsors and

the many organizations that are putting their concern for gun violence into action by supporting this bill, and I urge the Senate to act on the bills the House has already passed.

#### BUILD A WALL

(Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, today the House joined the Senate in approving almost \$4.6 billion in taxpayer money to address the growing security and humanitarian crisis at our southern border.

We all share sympathy for the children and individuals who find themselves in suffering conditions at our southern border, but we should not confuse that the action that the House took today addresses the real crux of the problem at our southern border. Indeed, less than 5 percent of the funds that we approved will have a realistic impact on reducing the plague of illegal immigration that faces our country.

I call upon my colleagues and I call upon the Speaker, upon our return after the Independence Day recess, to take up this issue and send a clear message around the world that this country intends to enforce its borders and enforce its immigration laws.

Madam Speaker, I support and call upon the Speaker to allow us to provide the funding to build a wall at our southern border and support the President's efforts to control illegal immigration.

#### THE FIGHT FOR THE CHILDREN WILL CONTINUE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this was a tough week for those of us who, as mothers, have a deep pain for the conditions of our children.

It was a difficult week because Mr. Ramirez and his toddler died trying to seek an opportunity in the United States.

It was a difficult week because this administration rejected Mr. Ramirez from the Matamoros bridge and forced him to cross the Rio Grande.

Today, I voted "no" for the \$4.5 billion, moneys that I know are needed and that passed and were provided for those in need. If my vote was needed to pass the bill, I would have done so.

But I am saddened by the fact that we passed a bill that does not have the strengthened protocols for treating the difficulties of children and their health needs:

It does not have the provisions dealing with the quality of the treatment of the children, the sanitation and safety;

It does not have the idea that children can only remain in a place for 90 days;

It does not have the ability to have a program that talks about or puts in place how these children are treated as relates to their healthcare and other matters.

So, I will continue to fight because these children's lives are important at the border and around the Nation, and we will get to a point where we can pass legislation that will treat these children who are suffering and fleeing in the right way.

#### WE MUST DO BETTER

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, once again, I say I am blessed to be an American citizen and honored to be a Member of the United States Congress.

Today is a bittersweet day for me as, today, I was able to bring my two grandchildren on the floor of this House, a courtesy that we afford each other as Members of this luscious body: my 1-year-old granddaughter, Jimena Luna De La Rosa, and my grandson, Joaquin Cruz De La Rosa.

But, at the same time, we voted for less than what we should have for the lives of so many men, women, and children who seek to come to the greatest land on Earth, the United States of America.

We must do better. We must do more. And it is time that we push back on a President who considers the gold standard to be the gold on a toilet instead of the gold standard that we have come to be known for around the world when it comes to having open arms of welcoming good human beings to this great country, to be part of this great land.

#### CONGRATULATING THE HECTOR GODINEZ FUNDAMENTAL HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS SOFTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Hector Godinez Fundamental High School women's softball team on their first ever CIF Southern Section championship victory. The team clinched their first ever title for the school and for Santa Ana Unified School District.

Their head coach, Ed Medina, has been the coach since the school opened in 2007 and was named the 2019 Orange County Softball Coach of the Year.

His assistant coaches—Clarissa Castellanos, Kevin Pola, and Selene Pola—are also to be commended.

Again, I congratulate the team, the coaches, and, of course, Principal Jesse Church on a job well done.

Congratulations, Grizzlies.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. MCCAUL, Texas  
Mr. DUFFY, Wisconsin  
Mr. HURD, Texas  
Mr. CLOUD, Texas  
Mr. SPANO, Florida

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 1903(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy:

Mr. RUTHERFORD, Florida

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, so we just took up the humanitarian crisis that is going on at our border and passed the Senate bill, so there will be a tremendous amount of money that will be going to provide more beds, shelter, food, transportation, whatever is needed. The one thing that the Senate bill is especially void of is money to secure our border.

It is something to say that, with all of the problems in the Senate bill, the things that were not addressed in the Senate bill, the fact that it was so much better than the House bill says an awful lot about the House bill and its shortcomings.

We have, still, and will after this bill is signed into law and money is put into use, a crisis on our southern border.

As was pointed out to me after some of us visited Normandy with the Speaker on the 75th anniversary of D-Day, on D-Day, we had 150,000 or so Allied troops that invaded Normandy, over 150,000, a tremendous number, landing craft, parachuting. Yet just in the month of May, that is about how many invaded our southern border—that we caught. We don't know how many didn't get caught.

Some think that for every one we actually catch and in-process, there is one that gets away. We don't know.

We know that there are a great number of people who are not caught because they are picked up on cameras



and with other information that is gleaned on the border.

But it will continue to be a problem after this money is spent, and there is some concern—it is legitimate—that when you have what the civil litigation would indicate is an attractive nuisance—that is the terminology in a lawsuit—and you don't put up a fence, a wall, something to impede people from coming into property illegally, then, if they hurt themselves—and the example most people think of is a swimming pool or a pool or a pond.

□ 1745

If you have that water on your property, and you don't bother to put up a fence or a wall, and someone comes onto your property and drowns, you are going to end up paying a tremendous amount of money, normally, to the family of whoever drowned coming onto your property when it was not properly secured with a fence or a wall.

That is not to say it has to be electrified or some kind of really intense structure. But you need to have something that would impede somebody from coming in and drowning in your water.

Now, the moment of silence earlier, most of us were deeply moved by the picture, horrendously tragic, of a child, who seemed to be so close, even sharing the father's shirt, with her little arm around his neck.

Having had girls growing up, that is an emotional picture for some of us especially.

But we have what most would say is the highest-evolved justice system, judicial system, litigation system in history. It has come through thousands of years of different types of laws, be them looking up at the bust of Hammurabi, the Code of Hammurabi, the Justinian Code. We have a Napoleonic Code.

We have had thousands of years of laws, and the civil litigation in this country is perhaps at the most perfected—a long way from being perfect, but as perfected as it has ever been anywhere.

That is where this concept of attractive nuisance has evolved and arisen from. There is a responsibility when you know there is something so attractive that people will be tempted to break the law and enter that property illegally, potentially, to their own detriment.

What are you supposed to do if you are a caring individual in charge of property? You put up a fence or wall, just like our former President Obama did.

I understand he built a 10-foot wall around his home. That is a good, responsible thing to do. It was good enough for the President when he was in the White House to raise the height of the fence and wall around the White House, and it is good enough for the former President as he built a wall around his private residence.

It is a good, responsible thing to do by a responsible person in charge of

property, not only to provide privacy, but also to keep people from being lured to their own detriment.

It is high time we address that on our southern border. There are very few people in this body, on either side of the aisle, who have not at some point said that we need to secure our border, that we can't keep having people pour into this country illegally.

But something strange has happened as our friends have taken over the majority and Republicans have moved into the minority. Some people have realized: Wait a minute. If these people keep flooding into our country from other countries illegally, and they see us as the party that keeps the border porous and open for them to keep pouring in, they will surely reward us with their votes, so we will be able to develop a permanent majority.

The only trouble with that is that when that happens, we are destroying the goose that had been laying golden eggs of opportunity, freedom, incredible liberty like the world had never seen before, the United States of America and our Constitution, followed with the Bill of Rights.

Yes, it has taken a while to get them continuing to evolve toward greater perfection. But we have to do something, because if we don't, if we continue to have people pouring into the United States—when you look at the example of Normandy with 150,000 or so, we had that many illegally invading America in 1 month.

We have to do something because the people pouring in have not been educated on the responsibilities of maintaining self-government. They will end up forcing this country—not intentionally but because they do not understand the responsibility involved in continuing this little experiment in self-government that has lasted 230 years. They will unintentionally give way to either communism or progressivism, if you prefer that these days, or a pure dictatorship.

It is very disconcerting that, in this country, there is more and more rising emotion between different political thought.

Look at the difference between the American Revolution, the 8 years that it took to win our independence, 1775 to 1783, and toward the end of the year when the Treaty of Paris was signed. It started, "In the Name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity." The British signed that. They thought that would be an oath that they would have to take so seriously in England that they would not breach that oath taken in the name of the "Most Holy and Undivided Trinity."

Historians know, normally, a government doesn't last more than 200 years, and they are lucky if they last 200 years. We have gone 230.

People look at the 10 years of the French Revolution, from about 1789, when our Constitution was ratified and when the Bastille was stormed, to 1799. What was the result of the French Rev-

olution? It was an Emperor named Napoleon.

Some historians say that they think the big difference between the U.S. Revolution resulting in liberty and the French Revolution resulting in hundreds of thousands of heads being cut off was our Revolution was about liberty.

The Founding Fathers were not out there to cut off heads. They were out there to grab and preserve liberty, whereas in the French Revolution, there was so much sentiment of getting revenge that it ended up culminating in an Emperor named Napoleon.

We now seem to have so much animus and so much anger. There is some, from time to time, in this body. But some of the most vocal people pushing for impeachment, like my friend AL GREEN, he, literally, is a friend. He is a Christian brother. I disagree with him strongly on the need for impeachment, but I like the guy. He is my brother. I know he would not be saying what he does unless he really believes it.

I would never wish harm on somebody that I cared about like that. We can disagree without being mean. Yet, too often now, that is being lost.

We have to preserve this place. We are about to recognize our anniversary, the Fourth of July, when the Declaration of Independence was made public. This needs to be a time of serious reflection.

It ought to include John Adams' encouragement to celebrate, have parades, enjoy families, enjoy the country. Of course, he says the firing of guns. We try not to do that. Instead, they use fireworks.

He knew there ought to be a celebration to remind us of the sacrifice, what was gained through that great sacrifice, and the responsibility that ensued, along with the liberty.

We should also remember the way they got to the Constitution was when Randolph, from Virginia, proposed that, after 5 weeks of yelling and fussing, that even though they didn't have money to hire a chaplain, why don't they take a few days off and gather together, on our Nation's Independence Day, at a local church there in Philadelphia. They ended up settling on the Reformed Calvinist Church, with the Right Reverend William Rogers presiding, and they worshipped God together. They were led in prayer by Reverend Rogers. They came back after that and gave us the most extraordinary founding document in the history of the world that we still use 232 years later. It was a time of reflection.

Unless we secure our border though, we will not be a shining light on a hill. We will be a transit station for people around the world to pass through, hoping for something great but, instead, only seeing a once-great country whose experiment in self-government was destroyed by too many people coming in too quickly, who did not know, as they hadn't been educated, how to go about preserving self-government.

My hope and prayer for this Independence Day is that we will return to an appreciation for the God from whom all blessings, all good things, flow. If we do that, we can preserve this place for generations to come.

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

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 25, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 559. To amend section 6 of the Joint Resolution entitled "A Joint Resolution to approve the Covenant To Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

in Political Union with the United States of America, and for other purposes".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 28, 2019, at 3:30 p.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, KATE KNUDSON WOLTERS, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 12 AND MAY 15, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Kate Knudson Wolters .....	5/13	5/15	France .....	.....	1,434.00	.....	1,473.53	.....	.....	.....	2,907.53
Committee total .....					1,434.00		1,473.53				2,907.53

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

KATE KNUDSON WOLTERS, June 13, 2019.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1448. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0802; FRL-9994-20-Region 9] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1449. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; SO2 Emission Limitations for United States Steel-Gary Works [EPA-R05-OAR-2018-0126; FRL-9995-67-Region 5] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1450. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Oklahoma; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report [EPA-R06-OAR-2016-0619; FRL-9995-36-Region 6] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1451. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Change of Address for Region 1 Reports; Technical Correction [FRL-9995-50-Region 1] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1452. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0512; FRL-9994-19-Region 9] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-

121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1453. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; KY; Attainment Plan for Jefferson County SO2 Nonattainment Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0625; FRL-9995-59-Region 4] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1454. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ethiprole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0493; FRL-9985-41] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1455. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; Minor New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Program Revisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2018-0176; FRL-9995-44-Region 6] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1456. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mefentrifluconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0002; FRL-9994-51] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1457. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluopyram; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0630; FRL-9994-36] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1458. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's Major final rules — Repeal of the Clean Power Plan; Emission Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Existing Electric Utility Generating Units; Revisions to Emission Guidelines Implementing Regulations [EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0355; FRL-9995-70-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT67) received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1459. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 18-105, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1460. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a notification pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1461. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil Rights, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1462. A letter from the Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1463. A letter from the Officer, Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1464. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical corrections to Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA) regulations and disposal sites designated under the MPRSA [FRL-9995-28-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF91) received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1465. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to the Marine Radar Observer Refresher Training Regulations [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0100] (RIN: 1625-AC46) received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1466. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Upper Potomac River, National Harbor, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0203] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1467. A letter from the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties: Semiannual Report to Congress, Third and Fourth Quarters, FY 2018 (April 1, 2018 — September 30, 2018), pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 345(b); and 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Armed Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 2500. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-120, Pt. 2).

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 466. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-130). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 3153. A bill to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support research on opioid addiction, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 3196. A bill to designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the "Vera Rubin Survey Telescope" (Rept 116-132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1146. A bill to amend Public Law 115-97 (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act) to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife refuge oil and gas program, and for other purposes; with an amendment

(Rept 116-133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 255. A bill to provide for an exchange of lands with San Bernardino County, California, to enhance management of lands within the San Bernardino National Forest, and for other purposes (Rept 116-134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 434. A bill to designate the Emancipation National Historic trail, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept 116-135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COX of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 3524. A bill to support the people of Central America and strengthen United States national security by addressing the root causes of migration from El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Education and Labor, Armed Services, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Financial Services, Homeland Security, Ways and Means, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 3525. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to establish uniform processes for medical screening of individuals interdicted between ports of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 3526. A bill to authorize certain counter terrorist networks activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 3527. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to assign the highest priority status for hospital care and medical services provided through the Department of Veterans Affairs to veterans who are former prisoners of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3528. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to carry out a program to facilitate the development of digital products for the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. MURPHY (for herself, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SOTO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of

Oklahoma, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SPANO, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. MAST, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRIST, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 3529. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to promptly notify appropriate State and local officials and Members of Congress if Federal officials have credible evidence of an unauthorized intrusion into an election system and a basis to believe that such intrusion could have resulted in voter information being altered or otherwise affected, to require State and local officials to notify potentially affected individuals of such intrusion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLOUD (for himself, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 3530. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enforce the licensure requirement for medical providers of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3531. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to allow the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide assistance to reduce the harmful impacts to people and property from multiple hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 3532. A bill to control the export to the People's Republic of China of certain technology and intellectual property important to the national interest of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ROBY (for herself and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 3533. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the definition of crime of violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. DUNN):

H.R. 3534. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to revise the operations of the United States Preventive Services Task Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 3535. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the work-study allowance program administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 3536. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify lynching as a deprivation of civil rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Mr. SPANO):

H.R. 3537. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to codify the Boots to Business Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 3538. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for new markets tax credit investments in the Rural Jobs Zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. PANNETTA):

H.R. 3539. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop best practices for the establishment and use of behavioral intervention teams at schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3540. A bill to ensure that certain loan programs of the Small Business Administration are made available to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, Agriculture, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 3541. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish a coastal climate change adaptation preparedness and response program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 3542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Indian coal production tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 3543. A bill to ensure that certain entrepreneurial development services of the Small Business Administration are made available to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 3544. A bill to decriminalize cannabis, to establish an Equitable Licensing Grant Program in the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Small Business, 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. BEYER (for himself and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 3545. A bill to provide incentives for hate crime reporting, provide grants for State-run hate crime hotlines, and establish additional penalties for individuals convicted under the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3546. A bill to prevent Federal agencies from interfering with the marijuana policy of States; to the Committee on Energy

and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Ms. PORTER):

H.R. 3547. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish the position of the Assistant Director and Student Loan Borrower Advocate of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, to establish the Office for Students and Young Consumers of the Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 3548. A bill to improve data collection and monitoring of the Great Lakes, oceans, bays, estuaries, and coasts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on deductions for personal casualty losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3550. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit for hiring veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 3551. A bill to ensure that Members of Congress have access to Federal facilities in order to exercise their constitutional oversight responsibilities; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms.

WILSON of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. SIRES, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CASE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MENG, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 3552. A bill to amend the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 to provide notification to relevant law enforcement agencies in the event that a background check conducted by the National Instant Criminal Background Check System determines that a person may not receive a firearm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms.

WILSON of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CASE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MENG, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 3553. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to ensure that

all firearms are traceable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms.

WILSON of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MENG, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 3554. A bill to incentivize State reporting systems that allow mental health professionals to submit information on certain individuals deemed dangerous for purposes of prohibiting firearm possession by such individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3555. A bill to amend the Department of Education Organization Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require publication of information relating to religious exemptions to the requirements of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 3556. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced excise tax rate for portable, electronically-aerated bait containers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 3557. A bill to prohibit the imposition of duties on the importation of goods under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 3558. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study on the state of hospital infrastructure in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 3559. A bill to control the export of electronic waste in order to ensure that such waste does not become the source of counterfeit goods that may reenter military and civilian electronics supply chains in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 3560. A bill to provide assistance for the operation of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail Visitor Center in Nebraska City, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MCADAMS, and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH):

H.R. 3561. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to require the Financial Stability Oversight Council to consider alternative approaches before determining that a U.S. nonbank financial company shall be supervised by the Board of Governors of

the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 3562. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. TLALIB, Ms. MENG, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ):

H.R. 3563. A bill to ensure the humane treatment of pregnant women by reinstating the presumption of release and prohibiting shackling, restraining, and other inhumane treatment of pregnant detainees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 3564. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the Optional Practical Training Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 3565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that eligibility to contribute to health savings accounts is not affected by receipt of, or payment for, hospital care or medical services under any law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for both service connected and non-service connected disabilities to include hospital care medical services and extended care services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio):

H.R. 3566. A bill to help individuals receiving disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act obtain rehabilitative services and return to the workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HOULAHAN (for herself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 3567. A bill to modify the requirements relating to the acquisition and disposal of certain rare earth materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3568. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to award grants to States to implement a tick identification pilot program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H.R. 3569. A bill to provide grants to States to encourage the implementation and maintenance of firearms licensing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BERA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3570. A bill to prohibit commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 3571. A bill to establish an Office of Subnational Diplomacy within the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CORREA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COX of California, Ms. PORTER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TED LIEU of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BERA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. LEVIN of California):

H.R. 3572. A bill to require States to carry out congressional redistricting in accordance with plans developed and enacted into law by independent redistricting commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Ms. HAALAND, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 3573. A bill to increase research, education, and treatment for cerebral cavernous malformations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. FLEISCHMANN):

H.R. 3574. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the establishment of a small business voucher program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. REED, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr.

MCNERNEY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SEN-SENBRENNER, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3575. A bill to establish the IMPACT for Energy Foundation; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself and Mr. HICE of Georgia):

H.R. 3576. A bill to reestablish the Commission on Wartime Contracting, and for other purposes; 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. McADAMS:

H.R. 3577. A bill to authorize the United States Postal Service to provide certain non-postal property, products, and services on behalf of State, local, and tribal governments; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 3578. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish and carry out a grant program to make grants to eligible institutions to plan and implement programs that provide comprehensive support services and resources designed to increase transfer and graduation rates at community colleges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 3579. A bill to direct the Postmaster General to conduct a study on retrofitting mail collection boxes with narrow mail slots to prevent theft of mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself and Mr. PALMER):

H.R. 3580. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act and Public Health Service Act to improve the reporting of abortion data to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3581. A bill to revise the composition of the Board of Zoning Adjustment for the District of Columbia so that the Board will consist solely of members appointed by the government of the District of Columbia, except when the Board is performing functions regarding an application by a foreign mission with respect to a chancery; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 3582. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the scope of the Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3583. A bill to amend section 116 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 3584. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for certain amendments relating to reporting requirements with respect to clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD (for himself, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CRIST, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. YOHO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SPANO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MAST, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 3585. A bill to provide for a moratorium on oil and gas leasing and exploration on the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Florida until 2029, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CORREA, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 3586. A bill to promote energy savings in residential and commercial buildings and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. FLETCHER):

H.R. 3587. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the effective date for the modification to net operating loss deductions in Public Law 115-97; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COX of California, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 3588. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish an initiative on improving the capacity of military criminal investigative organizations to prevent child sexual exploitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia):

H.R. 3589. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Greg LeMond, in recognition of his service to the Nation as an athlete, activist, role model, and community leader; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 3590. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a refundable tax credit to increase the take-home pay of American workers and enhance their financial stability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MCBATH, and Mr. GUEST):

H.R. 3591. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent certain alcohol and substance misuse; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. GIANFORTE):

H.R. 3592. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise the amount of minimum allotments under the Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HURD of Texas (for himself and Mr. McCAUL):

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution strongly condemning human rights violations, violence against civilians, and cooperation with Iran by the Houthi movement and its allies in Yemen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H. Res. 467. A resolution recognizing the essential contributions of frontline health workers to strengthening the United States national security and economic prosperity, sustaining and expanding progress on global health, and saving the lives of millions of women, men, and children around the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H. Res. 468. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Defense should review section 504 of title 10, United States Code, for purposes related to enlisting certain aliens in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H. Res. 469. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall Uprising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN of California (for himself, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. ROUDA, and Mr. COX of California):

H. Res. 470. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 1, 2019, as "National Health Literacy Day" to recognize the value of health literacy in transforming and improving health and health care for all people in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOLENAAR (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Res. 471. A resolution expressing support for the designation of 2019 as the "International Year of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. BASS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. DEFazio):

H. Res. 472. A resolution requesting the President to strongly condemn Jamal Khashoggi's killing, hold accountable individuals identified as culpable, and condemn imprisonment of and violence against journalists around the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers

granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 3524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform rule of Naturalization."

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 3525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 3526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 3527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 14, and 18 of the Constitution of the United States; the authority to raise and support an army, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. MURPHY:

H.R. 3529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 3530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 3533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:  
H.R. 3535.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution. [Page H2718]  
By Mr. BACON:  
H.R. 3536.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18  
Article III, Section 2  
By Mr. SCHNEIDER:  
H.R. 3537.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Sec. 8  
By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:  
H.R. 3538.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States  
By Mr. FERGUSON:  
H.R. 3539.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.  
By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:  
H.R. 3540.  
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. CARBAJAL:  
H.R. 3541.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2  
By Mr. GIANFORTE:  
H.R. 3542.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1  
By Mr. GOLDEN:  
H.R. 3543.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, whereby Congress shall have the power to provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States  
By Mr. EVANS:  
H.R. 3544.  
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. BEYER:  
H.R. 3545.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the US Constitution  
By Mr. BLUMENAUER:  
H.R. 3546.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3  
By Ms. BONAMICI:  
H.R. 3547.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution  
By Ms. BONAMICI:  
H.R. 3548.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8  
By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:  
H.R. 3549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Amendment XVI of the U.S. Constitution  
By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:  
H.R. 3550.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Amendment XVI of the U.S. Constitution  
By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:  
H.R. 3551.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
THE U.S. CONSTITUTION  
ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS  
CLAUSE 18  
The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.  
By Mr. CICILLINE:  
H.R. 3552.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.  
By Mr. CICILLINE:  
H.R. 3553.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.  
By Mr. CICILLINE:  
H.R. 3554.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.  
By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:  
H.R. 3555.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8  
By Mr. CRIST:  
H.R. 3556.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3  
By Ms. DELBENE:  
H.R. 3557.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. ENGEL:  
H.R. 3558.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 1  
By Mr. ESPAILLAT:  
H.R. 3559.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:  
The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof  
or  
Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:  
The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;  
By Mr. FORTENBERRY:  
H.R. 3560.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:  
H.R. 3561.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.  
By Ms. FUDGE:  
H.R. 3562.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to “regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”  
By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:  
H.R. 3563.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. GOSAR:  
H.R. 3564.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution  
By Mr. GOSAR:  
H.R. 3565.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution  
By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:  
H.R. 3566.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, clause 1  
By Ms. HOULAHAN:  
H.R. 3567.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution  
By Mr. KATKO:  
H.R. 3568.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution  
By Mr. KENNEDY:  
H.R. 3569.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8—to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce among the states  
By Mr. TED LIEU of California:  
H.R. 3570.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.  
By Mr. TED LIEU of California:  
H.R. 3571.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8  
By Ms. LOFGREN:  
H.R. 3572.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power to enact laws governing the time, place, and manner of elections for Members of the House of Representatives.  
Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution gives Congress the power to enact laws to enforce Section 2 of such Amendment, which requires Representatives to be apportioned among the several States according to their number.  
By Mr. LUJAN:  
H.R. 3573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. LUJÁN:

H.R. 3574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. LUJÁN:

H.R. 3575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 3576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. McADAMS:

H.R. 3577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 3580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 3582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution states that "Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." [Page H473]

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 3583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 3584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 3585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 3586.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Necessary and Proper Clause

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vest-

ed by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 3588.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 3589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 3590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 3591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause XVIII of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 35: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 51: Mrs. FLETCHER.  
H.R. 96: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
H.R. 141: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. BASS.  
H.R. 208: Ms. PLASKETT.  
H.R. 215: Mr. FULCHER.  
H.R. 230: Mrs. BEATTY.  
H.R. 372: Mr. RESCENHALER, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. STEFANK, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. REED, and Mr. FOSTER.  
H.R. 397: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. PAYNE.  
H.R. 413: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H.R. 473: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
H.R. 497: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. BARR.  
H.R. 510: Mr. KING of Iowa.  
H.R. 586: Mr. BUCSHON.  
H.R. 594: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.  
H.R. 647: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. LAMB, and Mrs. MCBATH.  
H.R. 649: Mr. ALLRED.  
H.R. 712: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 748: Mr. OLSON and Ms. DEAN.  
H.R. 808: Mr. SIMPSON.  
H.R. 846: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 849: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
H.R. 898: Mr. DUNN.  
H.R. 919: Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
H.R. 943: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.  
H.R. 948: Mr. RYAN and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1058: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SPANO, and Mr. TONKO.  
H.R. 1059: Mr. GALLAGHER.  
H.R. 1108: Mrs. HAYES, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 1109: Ms. TLAIB.  
H.R. 1111: Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 1116: Mr. SHERMAN.  
H.R. 1128: Mr. CÁRDENAS.  
H.R. 1140: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. FOSTER.  
H.R. 1153: Mr. SIREN.  
H.R. 1154: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Mr. NEGUSE.  
H.R. 1155: Ms. SHERRILL.  
H.R. 1175: Mr. LAMB and Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 1228: Mr. ALLRED.  
H.R. 1243: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 1274: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MENG, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.  
H.R. 1301: Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 1311: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. CRENSHAW.  
H.R. 1317: Mr. HASTINGS.  
H.R. 1327: Mr. HOYER, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.  
H.R. 1342: Mr. WELCH.  
H.R. 1374: Mr. PALMER.  
H.R. 1396: Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. ROY, Mr. REED, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.  
H.R. 1406: Mr. CLAY.  
H.R. 1423: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
H.R. 1441: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. RATCLIFFE.  
H.R. 1474: Mr. SOTO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. VAN DREW.  
H.R. 1529: Mr. GRIFFITH.  
H.R. 1530: Mr. OLSON and Mr. DESJARLAIS.  
H.R. 1534: Ms. SPEIER.  
H.R. 1549: Mr. MEEKS.  
H.R. 1554: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 1570: Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mrs. FLETCHER.  
H.R. 1629: Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 1641: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CROW, and Mr. HARRIS.  
H.R. 1642: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.  
H.R. 1652: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. HECK.  
H.R. 1679: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 1683: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.  
H.R. 1692: Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 1695: Mr. CALVERT and Mrs. LAWRENCE.  
H.R. 1696: Mr. PAPPAS.  
H.R. 1709: Ms. WATERS.  
H.R. 1739: Mr. DUNN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. GOSAR.  
H.R. 1740: Mr. DUNN.  
H.R. 1748: Ms. WEXTON.  
H.R. 1749: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 1753: Mr. PALAZZO.  
H.R. 1762: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 1767: Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 1768: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 1770: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
H.R. 1771: Ms. PORTER.  
H.R. 1773: Ms. WEXTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. KIM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CRIST, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KILMER, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. PORTER, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WILD, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 1837: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CLAY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. BABIN, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of



- Georgia, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. HILL of California.  
H.R. 1854: Mr. YOHO.  
H.R. 1855: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. LAMBORN.  
H.R. 1865: Mrs. LURIA, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BEYER, and Ms. SPEIER.  
H.R. 1869: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. ROSE of New York.  
H.R. 1873: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. LEVIN of California.  
H.R. 1882: Mr. DOGGETT.  
H.R. 1903: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. DELGADO.  
H.R. 1923: Mr. COOPER.  
H.R. 1959: Mr. MOOLENAAR.  
H.R. 1979: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. CASE.  
H.R. 1980: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. SIREs, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SABLÁN, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. BERA, Mrs. MURPHY, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. DEUTCH.  
H.R. 2011: Mr. CRENSHAW.  
H.R. 2014: Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 2062: Mr. GOLDEN.  
H.R. 2075: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
H.R. 2146: Mr. POCAN and Mr. KENNEDY.  
H.R. 2156: Mr. FOSTER.  
H.R. 2168: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 2211: Ms. CRAIG, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. DEGETTE.  
H.R. 2215: Mr. CASE.  
H.R. 2219: Mr. GRIFFITH.  
H.R. 2223: Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
H.R. 2235: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.  
H.R. 2239: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
H.R. 2256: Ms. MENG, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. NEGUSE.  
H.R. 2268: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
H.R. 2283: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 2314: Mr. BRINDISI and Mr. WRIGHT.  
H.R. 2328: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 2354: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 2360: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 2382: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. DOGGETT, and Ms. BASS.  
H.R. 2388: Mr. CRENSHAW.  
H.R. 2404: Ms. MOORE.  
H.R. 2408: Ms. OMAR and Mr. CARBAJAL.  
H.R. 2411: Mr. CORREA, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BRINDISI.  
H.R. 2415: Mr. NEGUSE and Ms. HILL of California.  
H.R. 2424: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. WELCH.  
H.R. 2460: Mr. BAIRD.  
H.R. 2467: Ms. HILL of California.  
H.R. 2482: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 2483: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. GALLAGHER.  
H.R. 2504: Mr. NEAL.  
H.R. 2507: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SOTO, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
H.R. 2508: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 2521: Mr. HECK and Mr. MOOLENAAR.  
H.R. 2543: Mr. SCHRADER.  
H.R. 2570: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 2571: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.  
H.R. 2577: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 2585: Ms. BASS and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 2600: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 2623: Mr. ALLRED.  
H.R. 2668: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.  
H.R. 2681: Mr. COX of California.  
H.R. 2708: Mrs. DEMINGS.  
H.R. 2711: Mr. COHEN and Mr. HASTINGS.  
H.R. 2733: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. STEWART.  
H.R. 2739: Mr. KILMER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BACON, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. FLORES.  
H.R. 2741: Ms. BONAMICI.  
H.R. 2749: Ms. TLAIB.  
H.R. 2750: Mr. WESTERMAN.  
H.R. 2763: Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 2764: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. GOMEZ.  
H.R. 2775: Ms. STEVENS.  
H.R. 2788: Mr. COLLINS of New York.  
H.R. 2802: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 2805: Mr. BUCHSON.  
H.R. 2812: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COOK, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.  
H.R. 2829: Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.  
H.R. 2852: Mr. DUFFY.  
H.R. 2862: Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
H.R. 2875: Mr. CÁRDENAS.  
H.R. 2876: Mr. CÁRDENAS.  
H.R. 2881: Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
H.R. 2901: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
H.R. 2909: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
H.R. 2931: Mr. SIREs.  
H.R. 2934: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. MEADOWS.  
H.R. 2975: Mr. JEFFRIES.  
H.R. 2988: Mr. LAMBORN.  
H.R. 3036: Mr. HECK.  
H.R. 3073: Mr. WELCH.  
H.R. 3080: Mr. RASKIN.  
H.R. 3082: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. CUMMINGS.  
H.R. 3097: Mr. LUJÁN.  
H.R. 3098: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.  
H.R. 3113: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. WELCH, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. MENG, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TRONE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.  
H.R. 3114: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COX of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SHALALA, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
H.R. 3119: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 3128: Mr. BRADY and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
H.R. 3138: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H.R. 3154: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. MEEKS.  
H.R. 3159: Mr. GRIFFITH.  
H.R. 3162: Mr. NEWHOUSE.  
H.R. 3170: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H.R. 3175: Mrs. MCBATH.  
H.R. 3182: Mr. GOODEN.  
H.R. 3192: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
H.R. 3195: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. GOMEZ.  
H.R. 3219: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 3230: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 3266: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 3296: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 3298: Ms. BASS.  
H.R. 3306: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
H.R. 3315: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 3348: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.  
H.R. 3350: Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 3361: Mr. NEWHOUSE.  
H.R. 3370: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 3374: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. KENNEDY.  
H.R. 3376: Mr. MCEACHIN.  
H.R. 3394: Ms. HAALAND, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.  
H.R. 3396: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
H.R. 3404: Mr. MCEACHIN.  
H.R. 3412: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SMUCKER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 3423: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H.R. 3435: Ms. OMAR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 3451: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 3452: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.  
H.R. 3472: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.  
H.R. 3483: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
H.R. 3500: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
H.R. 3502: Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Miss RICE of New York.  
H.R. 3522: Mr. WATKINS.  
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. ENGEL.  
H.J. Res. 35: Mr. CASE.  
H.J. Res. 64: Mr. SIREs and Mr. TRONE.  
H. Con. Res. 20: Ms. HAALAND.  
H. Res. 23: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.  
H. Res. 60: Mr. CISNEROS.  
H. Res. 138: Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
H. Res. 246: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. KELLER.  
H. Res. 255: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.  
H. Res. 326: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. FLETCHER.  
H. Res. 374: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.  
H. Res. 408: Mr. OLSON.  
H. Res. 428: Mr. LUJÁN.  
H. Res. 442: Ms. MOORE.  
H. Res. 444: Mr. HARDER of California and Mr. KENNEDY.  
H. Res. 457: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. MENG.  
H. Res. 465: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. LURIA.

#### DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2205: Mr. FITZPATRICK.



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 2019

No. 109

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord, the center of our joy, we come to You, drawn by Your unconditional love. Lord, give us reverential awe as You open our eyes to see Your power and majesty.

Help our lawmakers become aware of Your presence, giving them Your peace and illuminating their paths. May they rejoice because You are their refuge. Lord, bless their families, surrounding them with the shield of Your favor. Draw our Senators close to You and to one another in humility and service.

And, Lord, we thank You for the faithfulness of the 2019 U.S. Senate summer pages as they prepare to leave us. We pray that You would bless and keep them. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 90 seconds as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, June is Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month.

It is important to recognize the impact Alzheimer's has on families in

Iowa and across the country and to recognize the cost to taxpayers because of the care it takes in the last years of their lives. This disease robs Americans of their memories and impacts their ability to speak, pay attention, and exercise judgment.

The best way for Congress to help with Alzheimer's disease is to ensure adequate research funding to find treatments. As Congress considers appropriations for next year, we should continue to fund research and work toward curing this disease.

### FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on another point, the Supreme Court made a decision this week that I very much disagree with. I am an advocate for the Freedom of Information Act and for the public's business being public, and this Supreme Court decision inhibited that.

In a self-governed society, the people ought to know what their government is up to. Transparency laws, like the Freedom of Information Act, help to provide access to information in the face of an opaque and obstinate government. Unfortunately, a recent Supreme Court ruling and new regulations at the EPA and the Department of the Interior are undermining access to there being public information.

In other words, the public's business ought to be public. So I am working on legislation to address these developments and to promote access to government records. Americans deserve an accountable government, and transparency leads to accountability.

### TRIBUTE TO NICK NURSE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on a little lighter note, I am proud to say that the NBA season concluded with a University of Northern Iowa graduate's being able to call himself a champion.

The Toronto Raptors' head coach, Nick Nurse, graduated from my alma

mater. He played for the University of Northern Iowa Panthers from 1985 to 1989. Nick went on to coach numerous teams, including for Grand View University in Des Moines. Nick knows how to reignite hometown pride. He led the first and only boys' Class 3-A championship for Kuemper Catholic High School in Carroll, IA. He is a class act. Congratulations to Nick.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

### BORDER SECURITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 8 weeks ago, the administration sent Congress an urgent request for humanitarian money for the border. For 8 weeks, we have seen evidence nearly every day that the conditions have been getting worse. Yet, during all of this time, our Democratic House colleagues have been unable to produce a clean measure to provide this humanitarian funding with its having any chance of becoming law.

The proposal they finally passed this week was way to the left of the mainstream. The President made it clear it would earn a veto, not a signature. Even so, in an abundance of fairness, the Senate voted on Speaker PELOSI's effort—poison pill riders and all. It earned just 37 votes. The House proposal earned 37 votes here. Fortunately, we do have a chance to make

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4587

law this week on a hugely bipartisan basis.

The Senate advanced a clean, simple humanitarian funding bill yesterday by a huge margin. Thanks to Chairman SHELBY and Senator LEAHY, this bipartisan package sailed through the Appropriations Committee 30 to 1, and it passed the full Senate yesterday—now listen to this—84 to 8. We sent that clean bill over to the House by a vote of 84 to 8. The Shelby-Leahy legislation has unified the Appropriations Committee, and it has unified the Senate. The administration would sign it into law.

So all that our House colleagues need to do to help the men, women, and children on the border this week is to pass this unifying bipartisan bill and send it to the President. For weeks, we have heard our House Democratic colleagues speaking a lot about the poor conditions, the overstretched facilities, the insufficient supplies. Our bill gives them the chance today to actually do something about it.

Now, I understand that instead of moving forward with this bipartisan bill, the Speaker is signaling she may choose to drag out the process even more and might persist in some variety of the leftwing demands that caused the House bill to fail dramatically in the Senate yesterday. I understand that some of the further changes the House Democrats are discussing may be unobjectionable things the Trump administration may be able to help to secure for them administratively.

Yet it is crystal clear that some of these new demands would drag this bipartisan bill way back to the left and jeopardize the Shelby-Leahy consensus product that unified the Senate and that is so close to becoming law—this close.

For example, I understand that the House Democrats may ask the Speaker to insist on—listen to this—cutting the supplemental funding for Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the Department of Defense. In the middle of this historic surge on the border, they want to claw back some of this badly needed money from the men and women who are down there on the frontlines. It looks like these cuts would represent pay cuts to ICE staff, including pay that people have already earned, and cuts to the money for investigating child trafficking.

Chairman SHELBY and Senator LEAHY have already reached a bipartisan agreement. Both sides have already compromised. We are standing at the 5-yard line. Yet, apparently, some in the House want to dig back into that “abolish ICE” playbook and throw a far-left partisan wrench into the whole thing.

Let me be perfectly clear. I am glad the Speaker and the administration are discussing some of these outstanding issues, but if the House Democrats send the Senate back some partisan effort to disrupt our bipartisan progress, we will simply move to table it. The U.S.

Senate is not going to pass a border funding bill that will cut the money for ICE and the Department of Defense. It is not going to happen. We already have our compromise. The Shelby-Leahy Senate bill is the only game in town. It is time to quit playing games. It is time to make it law.

I urge my colleagues across the Capitol to take up the clean, bipartisan bill that the Senate passed 84 to 8 and, without any more unnecessary delays, send it on to President Trump for his signature.

#### TOBACCO-FREE YOUTH ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, just last month, I introduced legislation, along with my colleague from Virginia, Senator KAINE, to address a serious and growing public health issue. As Senator KAINE and I laid out in May, the growing popularity and accessibility of tobacco products like e-cigarettes and vapor products are endangering America's youth.

The CDC estimates that in 2018 youth e-cigarette use in America increased by 1.5 million. So we introduced legislation that would accomplish something very important—raising the minimum age for purchasing tobacco and vapor products to 21 nationwide. We want to put a huge dent in these pathways to childhood addiction and help get these products out of high schools altogether.

Now, as a Virginian and a Kentuckian, neither Senator KAINE nor I lack an appreciation for the history of tobacco in America. For generations, this hugely important cash crop helped to build our States and, indeed, the whole Nation's early prosperity. Yet new doors are open today to Kentucky's growers and producers, and parents back home are rightly worried that e-cigarettes and vapor products pose new threats to the young people at a critical stage in their developments.

So I was proud to take the lead on this, and I am proud my colleague from Virginia has joined me in leading this effort to give this cause the strong bipartisan momentum it richly deserves. Our measure cleared an important milestone yesterday. The HELP Committee approved our Tobacco-Free Youth Act and advanced it here, to the floor, along with other legislation.

I thank Chairman ALEXANDER, Ranking Member MURRAY, and all of our colleagues on the committee for including our legislation in this package and advancing it. I look forward to continuing to work with them, with Senator KAINE, and with all of our colleagues as we work to get this important proposal signed into law.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter entirely, later today, the Senate will vote to fulfill a solemn

responsibility. For the 59th consecutive year, we will pass the National Defense Authorization Act. I hope and expect we will do it by a wide, bipartisan margin.

It would be difficult to overstate the importance of this legislation to the ongoing missions of our Nation's men and women in uniform. The NDAA is simultaneously a target to guide the modernization of our all-volunteer force; a supply line to restore readiness and keep U.S. personnel equipped with the most cutting-edge, lethal capabilities; a promise of critical support services to military families; and a declaration to both our allies and adversaries of America's strategic resolve.

This year's bill authorizes the investments that will support all these bills and a major pay raise for military personnel to boot.

I am especially proud that it supports the ongoing missions of Kentucky's installations and the many military families who call my State home.

The NDAA is a product of a robust, bipartisan process that has consumed our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee for weeks. Nearly 300 amendments were adopted during markup. So today, once again, I would like to thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED for their leadership throughout this process. They produced legislation that each Member of this body should be proud of. Particularly in these troubled times, this is exactly—exactly—the message the Senate needs to send. I look forward to passing it today.

Passing the NDAA itself is not the only important message the Senate will send this week on national security. On Friday morning, we will vote on a badly ill-conceived amendment that would literally make our Nation less secure and make American servicemembers less safe. I respect my colleagues, but this amendment from Senator UDALL and others is a half-baked and dangerous measure—about as half-baked and dangerous as we have seen on the floor in quite some time. It should be soundly rejected.

We know that our Democratic colleagues have political differences with President Trump—I think the whole country has gotten that message pretty loud and clear—but they have chosen a terrible time and a completely irresponsible manner to express themselves. Rather than work with the President, who shares the goal of avoiding war with Iran, they have gratuitously chosen to make him the enemy.

Let me repeat that. Rather than work with the President to deter our actual enemies, they have chosen to make him the enemy.

At the very moment that Iran has been stepping up its aggression throughout the Middle East, these Senators are proposing radical new restrictions on the administration's ability to defend U.S. interests and our partners.

The Udall amendment would require the administration to secure explicit authorization from Congress before our forces would be able to respond to all kinds of potential Iranian attacks. That would include attacks on American civilians.

Let me say that again. Some of our colleagues want us to go out of our way and create a brandnew obstacle that would block the President from swiftly responding if Iran attacks American civilians, our U.S. diplomatic facilities, or Israel, or the military forces of an ally or partner, or if Iran closes the Strait of Hormuz. In all of these scenarios, the Udall amendment would hamstring the executive branch from reacting quickly. In modern warfare, time is of the essence. The War Powers Resolution explicitly recognizes the reality that administrations may need to respond quickly and with flexibility.

This amendment could even constrain our military from acting to prevent an imminent attack. As written, it appears to suggest they must absorb the attack, take the attack first before defending themselves. And even then, for how long would they be allowed to conduct retaliatory strikes? Completely absurd. Totally dangerous.

Let's take an example. Iran attacks Israel. No timely response from the United States, especially if Congress happens to be on recess. Iran attacks American citizens. The President's hands would be tied. This is never how the American Presidency has worked, for a very good reason.

So I would ask my colleagues to stop obsessing about Donald Trump for a moment and think about a scenario involving a future or past President. Hypothetically, then, would it be appropriate for Congress to tie a President's hands with legislation preventing military action to defend NATO allies from a Russian attack without explicit congressional approval? If conflict came in August and the United States and its NATO allies didn't act decisively, frontline states could be gobbled up before Congress could even convene to consider an AUMF.

The Udall amendment would represent a huge departure from the basic flexibility that Presidents in both parties have always had to take immediate military steps, short of a full-scale war, to respond to immediate crises.

This ploy is being advertised as some kind of courageous reassertion by Congress of our constitutional authority, but it is nothing of the sort. It is a departure from our constitutional traditions and norms.

Nobody is talking about a full-scale war with Iran—not the President; not the administration. Heaven forbid, if that situation were to arrive, consultation with Congress and widespread public support would, of course, be necessary. The Udall amendment is something completely different. It defines self-defense in a laughably narrow way and then in all other situations pro-

poses that President Trump should be stripped of the basic powers of his office unless Democrats in Congress write him a permission slip. I don't think so.

This would be a terrible idea at any moment, let alone as Iran is escalating its violence and searching for any sign of American weakness.

So I would ask my colleagues: Do not embolden Iran. Do not weaken our deterrence. Do not undermine our diplomacy. Do not tie the hands of our military commanders. Reject this dangerous mistake when we vote on the Udall amendment tomorrow.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1790, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1790) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Inhofe) modified amendment No. 764, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Romney) amendment No. 861 (to amendment No. 764), to provide that funds authorized by the Act are available for the defense of the Armed Forces and United States citizens against attack by foreign hostile forces.

McConnell amendment No. 862 (to amendment No. 861), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 863 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 764), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 864 (to amendment No. 863), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 865, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 866 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 865), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 867 (to amendment No. 866), of a perfecting nature.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled for noon today be at 11:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

S. 1790

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as the leader and I announced yesterday, we have an agreement in place to vote on passage of the Defense authorization bill today and then on an amendment to the bill tomorrow, led by Senators UDALL, KAIN, MERKLEY, MURPHY, PAUL, and LEE, to accommodate all Senators who wish to vote. That is why we are doing it tomorrow. If the Udall amendment is passed, it would be adopted to the Defense authorization bill even though the vote occurs afterward.

I want to thank the leader for understanding our position that the Senate ought to vote on this important amendment, which in essence would prohibit funds for hostilities with Iran without an affirmative authorization from Congress. Congress gets to approve or disapprove wars, period. It is crucial for the Senate and Congress as a whole to examine potential conflicts and to exercise our authority in matters of war and peace.

Let's start with the facts. Ever since President Trump withdrew from the Iran nuclear deal, our two countries have been on a path toward conflict. For the past month, we have been locked in a cycle of escalating tensions with Iran. Iran attacked a tanker in the Gulf region and shot down a U.S. surveillance drone. The U.S. Government has responded to both provocations, and the President reportedly considered and then pulled back on a military strike.

The American people are worried—and rightly so—that even if the President isn't eager for war, he may stumble us into one. Small provocations in the Middle East can often spin out of control. Our country has learned that the hard way. When the President is surrounded by hawkish advisers like John Bolton and Secretary Pompeo, the danger is even more acute.

So while the majority leader says that "no one is talking about war," that is only true until the folks do start talking about war, and by then, the chance to clarify that this President requires congressional authorization before engaging in major hostilities may have passed us by.

And this not talking about war? Well, the President said he was 10 minutes away from major provocation, if the reports are correct. It would have been on Iranian soil, three missile bases. And the President at one point said, in effect: We will smash Iran, blow it to smithereens—or something to that effect. People are talking about war. This President is.

Even though it is plainly written in the Constitution that the legislature alone, not the Executive, has the power to declare war, the Trump administration is already signaling that it doesn't need Congress. The President and his team are playing up links between al-Qaida and Iran, potentially setting the stage for them to claim legal authority under the sweeping 2001 authorization of military force to strike Iran without congressional approval.

The President himself, asked if he believes he has the authority to initiate military action against Iran without first going to Congress, replied, "I do." He continued, "I do like keeping Congress abreast, but I don't have to do it legally."

So when it comes to a potential war with Iran, Mr. President Trump, yes, you do. You do. You do.

The Founding Fathers—our greatest wisdom in this country—worried about housing war powers in the executive branch for precisely this reason.

As James Madison wrote to Jefferson, who was not there when they were writing the Constitution—he was plenipotentiary to France—here is what Madison wrote to Jefferson:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war to the Legislature.

That is Madison, who put more into this Constitution than anyone else.

Let me read it again. It is clear as a bell. Madison wrote to Jefferson:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war to the Legislature. there were ever a President who fits that description, it is Donald Trump.

The Framers worried about an overreaching Executive waging unilateral war. My colleagues know well that we haven't had an overreaching Executive like the one we have now for quite some time, if ever. So if it comes to it, we should expect the President to challenge Congress's war powers. He has basically already told us that he would.

So my colleagues should vote to strengthen our ability to oversee this President's strategy with Iran. That is what the bipartisan Udall amendment would do—nothing more. There has been some fearmongering about how the amendment might tie the hands of our military. It would not. It is explicitly written that in no way should it be construed to prevent the U.S. military from responding to an act of aggression or from acting in self-defense.

It is high time that Congress reestablish itself as this Nation's decider of war and peace. We have been content too long to let the Executive take all of the initiatives and responsibility for military action abroad. The American people are weary of the endless conflicts in the Middle East and the loss of American lives and American treasure.

The Udall amendment would mark the beginning of Congress reasserting its constitutional powers. I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote yes tomorrow.

#### G20 ECONOMIC SUMMIT

Mr. President, President Trump has arrived at the G20 economic summit in Japan before traveling for a state visit in South Korea. Already, the President has managed to insult our long-standing allies, including Germany and Japan, the host nation.

Rather than undermining our alliances, here are two important things the President should do at the G20:

First, Russia and Vladimir Putin. When President Trump sits down with the Russian President, he must send an unmistakable warning that the United States will not tolerate foreign interference in our elections in 2020. President Trump has no excuse. The Mueller report, FBI Director Wray, virtually our entire intelligence community concluded that Russia was guilty of interfering in our elections and that 2020 would be the next big show.

President Trump has a responsibility to defend the United States. By directly challenging Putin, he will send a signal not merely to Putin but to all of our adversaries that interfering with our election is unacceptable and that they will pay a price—a strong price—for trying.

Second, China and President Xi. Now that trade negotiations between our countries seemed to have stalled, there is a chance to put them back on track. For that to happen, the President must remain strong. He cannot go soft now and accept a bad deal that falls short of reforming China's rapacious economic policies—cyber espionage, forced technology transfers, state-sponsorship, and, worst of all, denial of market access.

President Trump, you know it. We have talked about it. You have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to reform China's economic relations with the world and put American businesses and American workers on a level playing field. Stay tough. Don't give in. Make sure Huawei cannot come to the United States and we cannot supply it. Enough with the criticism for our allies. Aim it at our adversaries, China and Russia, and you will have a much better chance of making the G20 a success for American interests.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

S. 1790

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, tomorrow morning the Senate will vote on whether to disarm our troops as they face a growing campaign of Iranian aggression in the Middle East. Tomorrow morning the Senate will vote on whether to empower the Ayatollahs as they continue to rampage across the Middle East, attacking U.S. aircraft, attacking ships in the high seas, threatening our troops in Iraq, Syria,

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Qatar, and elsewhere. That is because we will be voting tomorrow morning on an amendment that says, very simply: "No funds may be used to conduct hostilities against the Government of Iran, against the Armed Forces of Iran, or in the territory of Iran, except pursuant to an Act or a joint resolution of Congress specifically authorizing such hostilities."

That amendment is simple—I would say simple-minded—but it is simply an act of appeasement against the Ayatollahs who are currently conducting attacks against the United States and our interests on a regular and growing basis.

Let's just take a case in point. The earlier version of this amendment included no exception—no exception whatsoever—for our troops to defend themselves against an attack by Iran. You might say that is a careless omission. I would, however, say that even the fact that it was changed after I pointed out that omission just goes to show you that the root of this amendment is Trump derangement syndrome.

It does have an exception now. Let's look at that: "Nothing can be construed to restrict the use of the United States Armed Forces to defend—against an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces."

What does that mean? What does it mean to defend against an attack? I don't know. I am not sure. If an F-15 pilot is shot upon in international airspace, I guess he can deploy countermeasures—chaff—to disrupt the missile. Can he shoot back? Can he shoot back at the Iranian missile battery that shot at him?

Let's say our troops who are garrisoned in places like Iraq and Syria have incoming mortar fire by an Iranian proxy militia. I guess they can duck and cover in a concrete bunker. I guess that is defense. Can they use counterbattery fire to shoot back at that mortar firing position? I don't know. I don't know. Can they? Beats me.

We have thousands of troops stationed at Al Udeid Air Base, the main airbase from which we conducted operations against the Islamic State. Let's say they have a missile coming in. I guess they can use a patriot missile defense system to shoot that missile down. Can they fire back at the missile battery that shot that missile, which has many more to fire? I don't know. Can they? It seems like offense to me. Maybe it is defense.

Let's take a page from history. In 1988, Ronald Reagan authorized one of the largest naval engagements since World War II in response to the exact kinds of attacks against commercial shipping and the U.S. Navy on the high seas that we have seen from Iran in the last 2 weeks. However, that operation didn't commence for 4 days; it was 4 days after a U.S. Navy frigate hit one of the Iranian mines before we struck

back. Is that in defense against an Iranian attack? It doesn't seem that it would be, to me. I don't know.

What we are debating here is how many lawyers can dance on a head of a pin when our soldiers are in harm's way. They need to know that when they are shot upon, they can fire back, and they can eliminate that threat without any politician in Washington or any lawyer at the Department of Defense looking over their shoulders and second-guessing them. That is not what they get from this amendment, though.

Consider also the consequences. Many of the speakers today will say this is about deescalating tension in the Middle East—deescalating. Who is escalating it? Who is the one firing on American aircraft? Not Donald Trump. Who is interfering with the freedom of navigation on the high seas? It is not Donald Trump; it is the Ayatollahs. They are the ones who have manufactured this crisis because they know that the United States is on the strategic offensive and that we have the initiative against Iran for the first time in 40 years.

This amendment, though, would only embolden them to continue the campaign of the last 2 months of gradually marching up the escalatory ladder. It started with threats. Then it was an attack on foreign vessels at port. Then it was an attack on foreign vessels on the high seas. Then it was an attack on an unmanned American aircraft. Next it might be an attack on a manned American aircraft or a U.S. ship. And the message we are going to send is this: Well, the Congress thinks that the Commander in Chief and, for that matter, battalion commanders on the ground don't have the authority and the flexibility they need to take the appropriate response, as opposed to cowering inside bunkers and using some defensive measures.

Let's also think about the language of this amendment. A lot of people are going to come here and say that this is about our constitutional authority, and we need to reclaim our authority, and we have given up too much authority to the executive branch. In a lot of instances I would agree with that. But this amendment is only about Iran. It is not about China; it is not about Russia—even though this President has forced our Democratic friends to finally discover their inner cold warrior.

This is only about Iran in the context of Iran shooting down an American aircraft just a week ago. What better message can you send that this is not about our constitutional authority? This is about trying to tie the hands of a Commander in Chief whom they dislike at a time when a foreign nation is targeting our aircraft and our servicemembers.

This amendment would be a loud and clear message to the Ayatollahs that we will not strike back, that they can escalate even further, and that there will not be swift reprisal. If there is, it

will generate intense controversy in our country. It will only embolden them further to march up that escalatory ladder and threaten American lives. It is a hall pass for Iranian escalation, really.

Look, there is no amendment, no bill, no paper resolution that can change the iron laws of geopolitics. Strength deters and weakness provokes. Wars are not won by paper resolutions. They are won by iron resolution. But this amendment embodies irresolution, weakness, timidity, diffidence.

This Congress on a good day can rename a post office, and that is only after months and months of debate about the post office. Are you telling me—are you telling me that if Iran shoots down an American aircraft or continues attacks on partners like the United Arab Emirates, then this Congress in a matter of minutes and hours is going to pass a resolution authorizing the use of force to respond to that kind of provocation? Please.

There is a reason we have one Commander in Chief, not 535 commanders in chief—or, I say again, 535 battalion commanders, the level at which some of these decisions ought to be made.

Think about the kind of debates we have, the know-nothings we have seen here in Washington over the last couple of weeks who would say: Oh, it wasn't Iran that made the attack. OK, it was Iran, but maybe it wasn't authorized by the senior leadership of Iran. OK, it was authorized, but it didn't really do that much damage. It is kind of like the old line of: It is not my dog. He didn't bite you. You kicked him first. That is what that debate would devolve into while our troops are at risk.

This is a terrible amendment. It will do nothing but put more American lives at risk and imperil our interests and our partners throughout the region.

I know that the minority leader said earlier that he is worried about the President stumbling into war. He said it last week on TV too. Nations don't bumble into war.

He and others have raised the prospect of endless wars, the wars we have been fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. They are long, and we have made lots of twists and turns on the way. But let's not forget that many of the Democrats in this Chamber voted to authorize those wars. We didn't bumble into those. They were considered, deliberate decisions.

President Trump said just a couple days ago that he is not talking about that kind of operation. He is talking about the exact kind of thing that Ronald Reagan did in response to Iranian aggression on the high seas. That didn't start a war. Ronald Reagan didn't start a war when he retaliated against Libya for acts of terrorism against our troops in 1986. Donald Trump didn't start a war when he struck Syria in 2017 and 2018 for gassing its own people. If you want a

Democratic example, Bill Clinton didn't start a war when he struck Iraq in 1993 and 1998.

This amendment purports to tie the hands of the Commander in Chief relative only to a single nation, which just so happens to be the nation that just shot down an American aircraft. The only result that will come of this amendment passing will be to embolden the Ayatollahs and make more likely that which its proponents wish to avoid.

I urge all of my colleagues to see the reality of this amendment and to vote no tomorrow morning.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I rise to speak in favor of the Udall amendment, a bipartisan amendment. I am a proud Virginian. The Commonwealth of Virginia is more connected to the Nation's military service by our map, by the installations in Virginia, and by personnel than any other State, and I am the proud father of a U.S. marine. I love serving with my colleagues on the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees.

Tomorrow we are going to vote on a question that cannot be more fundamental: Can President Trump take us to war with Iran without coming to Congress for authorization? That is the question. Can President Trump take us to war with Iran without coming to Congress for authorization? This is a matter of the utmost importance for this body, for the American public, and for our troops. Americans, especially those who have family serving in the military—and many of those families have seen their loved ones deployed multiple times since 2001—want to know what each Senator thinks about this important question.

The Udall amendment to the NDAA, which has bipartisan sponsorship, is very simple. It states that no funds will be expended in a war with Iran or on Iranian soil, except in self-defense, unless Congress takes the affirmative step of specifically authorizing those hostilities.

My colleague from Arkansas talked about lawyers dancing on the head of a pin, as he tried to suggest that "self-defense" was not a clearly defined term. I think most of my colleagues who read the language will believe it is incredibly clear; the President has the power to defend the Nation from an imminent attack or ongoing attack without asking anyone for permission. That is specifically stated in our resolution. There is no confusion about it. There is no attempt to limit a President's power to defend the Nation, but if the President decides that we need to go on an offensive war against a sovereign country, this amendment would suggest he could not do so unless he came to Congress.

Those voting for this amendment will say clearly that no war should be started unless Congress votes for it. Those

opposing the amendment will say clearly that it is OK for the President to go to war against Iran whenever and for whatever reason on his own.

Those who vote against this amendment, in my view, are essentially giving the President a green light to wage war anywhere, against anyone, on his own. That is not a power we should give to this President or any President. I believe, in my 6½ years in the Senate, there has only been one vote as serious as the vote we will cast tomorrow morning.

Why do I believe war should not be started without a vote of Congress? The Democratic leader outlined the clear constitutional history in this regard. It is Congress that declares war. The history and context of that provision in article I is very plain. At that time in the world, in 1787, war was for the Executive. It was for the King, the Emperor, the Monarch, the Sultan, the Pope, but the drafters of the American Constitution wanted to dramatically change history in this Nation and say that war for the United States of America should be a matter not for the Executive to declare but, instead, for the peoples' elected legislative body to declare.

Once declared, the President, as Commander in Chief, needs to be that commander. I agree with my colleague from Arkansas. You don't need 535 commanders, but it is not up to the President to initiate or declare war, constitutionally; it is clearly up to Congress.

The reason we should vote for this isn't just because of the constitutional provision. It is the value that underlies the constitutional provision. Why did the Framers put the question of war as a matter for the legislature? A congressional debate and vote is what is necessary for the American public and Congress to fully understand the stakes, to explain to the public and educate them why war is necessary—and especially, and most importantly, the debate and the vote by the legislative body is the evidence of support for the mission that American troops deserve if they are going to be sent into harm's way where they could be killed or injured or see their friends killed or injured.

I believe it is the height of public immorality. There could be nothing more immoral in the public space than to order our troops into harm's way, where they would risk injury and death if Congress is unwilling to consider and debate and vote on whether a war is in the national interest.

You have to go risk your life, you have to go be with others and potentially be injured or killed, but we don't want to have to vote on it. Could anything be more immoral than that? What this provision does is say that if we are going to be at war with Iran and, by example, with any nation, Congress should have the guts and backbone to come and cast a vote before we order our troops into harm's way.

Why is this debate important right now? We are in the middle of discussing the National Defense Authorizing Act, but I also want to point out two very important things, one an event and one a statement that may have occurred in the last week, since many of us took the floor last Wednesday.

On Thursday, a week ago today, President Trump ordered and then called off a missile strike against Iranian territory that would have been the start of a shooting war with Iran. It was a missile strike in the sovereign nation of Iran. Our military and all reasonable people understood that would have been responded to. So we were within 10 minutes. President Trump says he called off the strike on Iran with 10 minutes to spare.

We were within 10 minutes a week ago of being in a war.

The second thing that happened is, a few days ago, the President gave an exclusive interview to *The Hill* saying: "I do not need congressional approval to strike Iran."

Congress is irrelevant. I don't need to come to Congress.

The quote that the Democratic leader mentioned a few minutes earlier was that the President said: It is good to keep them abreast of the situation, but I am not legally required to do so.

How insulting for the President, who pledged at his inauguration to defend and support the Constitution, to not recognize that the article I branch—and we are the article I branch for a reason—must not be just consulted with but be on board with any wars expressed by their vote.

This President is holding the article I branch in contempt. Will we grovel and accept that monumental disrespect or will we insist that the President must follow the law?

For the record, I believe a war with Iran would be a colossal mistake. Its cause would be laid significantly at our feet by the United States and the Trump administration tearing up a diplomatic deal, tearing it up over the objections or over the recommendations of the then-Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, National Security Advisor, Joint Chiefs of Staff, tearing it up over the recommendations of our allies, tearing it up over the recommendations of the International Atomic Energy Agency. We tore up a diplomatic deal and raised the risk of an unnecessary war; that would be catastrophic.

After 18 years of two wars in the Middle East, where we still have troops deployed, we should not be fomenting, encouraging, blundering toward rushing into a third war in the Middle East. It would suck lives and resources away from more pressing priorities of our citizens. Boggling ourselves down in another war against a smaller, weaker, faraway nation would divert our attention from acting firmly to counter our chief competitor, China.

Furthermore, another war in the Middle East would represent another

broken promise by this President. Just as he said that Mexico would pay for a border wall, just as he promised not to cut the Medicaid Program before supporting an effort to eliminate the Affordable Care Act and slash Medicaid, the President criticized the Iraq war as a candidate and said he would end wars in the Middle East, not expand or multiply them.

I will give my colleague from Arkansas credit for having the courage of his convictions to come and state what he has stated on the floor. There are some in this body and the administration who have argued that a war with Iran would be a good thing or a necessary thing. Some have even suggested it would be an easy win. Let them come to the floor of the Senate and make that argument in full view of the American public and let Congress debate and vote and then be held accountable for decisions we make about war.

As I conclude, I thank the majority leader for scheduling this vote, and I especially thank the Democratic leader for firmly insisting it must be held. Tomorrow we will all speak to a fundamental question about war but also about this institution: Can President Trump take us to war with Iran without even coming to Congress?

I hope my colleagues will stand for the Constitution. We must provide assurance to our citizens, and we especially must provide assurance to our troops, that war is not based on the whim of this President or the whim of any President, but it must be based instead on a clear vote, following public debate by the peoples' elected legislature.

With that, I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from New Mexico.

**Mr. UDALL.** Madam President, I very much appreciate being joined on the floor by Senator Kaine and Senator Merkley. I appreciate Senator Kaine's very wise words. I think all of us are here standing up to hold the President accountable. We believe he should follow and obey the Constitution.

I rise to call upon this body to do its duty, to assume its constitutional responsibility, and to make it clear that the President cannot wage war against Iran without congressional authorization. Whether you are in favor of giving the President that authorization or whether, like me, you are opposed, everyone in this Chamber should vote in favor of our bipartisan amendment because a vote in favor is a vote to fulfill our sworn oath to uphold the Constitution. I appreciate that at long last the Senate will finally have this debate; that we will finally take this vote because these matters of war and peace are among the most consequential responsibilities that fall to Congress. These are the hard votes, and we must step up to take them.

I am proud to partner with Senators Kaine, Paul, Merkley, Durbin, Murphy, and Lee in this effort and to call

upon Congress to meet its constitutional responsibilities. After years of abdicating our responsibilities on matters of war, this entire body must stand up and show that we will not roll over for an unauthorized, unconstitutional war. We must pass this amendment.

This dangerous course with Iran began last May when the President unilaterally withdrew from the Iran nuclear agreement. This hard-fought diplomatic achievement denied Iran the nuclear material required to even begin work on a nuclear weapon. Since this administration turned away from diplomacy and resorted to a maximum pressure campaign to box in Iran, the risk of war has steadily risen.

Just last week, we were 10 minutes away from a strike on Iran, 10 minutes from a nightmare of escalation in the Gulf. This week, the President threatened Iran. I am quoting his words here—these are pretty strong words—he said to Iran: I threaten them with “great and overwhelming force,” and he used the word “obliteration.” That is not diplomacy; that is a drumbeat toward war without congressional approval.

Tensions are the highest they have been in many years, and the risk of a costly miscalculation grows day by day. Just days ago, the President falsely claimed he does not need congressional approval to launch strikes against Iran. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution could not be clearer: It is Congress and Congress alone that has the authority to “declare war.” This is not a close call; the Founders placed this responsibility squarely on our shoulders. The consequences of going to war are profound, so this decision rests with the people’s representatives, not one person—not even one President. It is time that Congress confront the administration’s rejection of diplomacy.

Our amendment prohibits funding for military action against Iran without congressional authorization. It does not prohibit war altogether; it prohibits an unconstitutional war, a war that has not been authorized by Congress.

We must be accountable to the American people and to our men and women in uniform whose lives would be on the line. Our soldiers are brave enough to face the danger of war. If my friends in this Chamber believe they should, we should be brave enough to be held accountable for that decision.

Some have claimed that this amendment would prohibit the President from defending the United States against attack. That is wrong. It is completely false. This amendment and the War Powers Act incorporated as part of it allow the United States to act in self-defense. I am going to quote from our amendment. The amendment clearly states that it shall not be interpreted “to restrict the use of the United States Armed Forces to defend against an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or

its Armed Forces.” It is explicit. The United States may defend itself against an attack by Iran. The claim that the military’s hands would be tied in the event of an emergency has no basis and cannot be used as an excuse to vote against the amendment.

I am heartened, as Senator KAINE was and as I am sure Senator MERKLEY will also say, that Senator MCCONNELL and the Republican leadership will finally allow debate and a vote on this amendment. This is what the American people want and deserve.

Over the years, Democratic and Republican Presidents alike have steadily encroached upon Congress’s war powers, and Congress has tacitly allowed that encroachment.

I stood up to President Obama when he threatened to attack Syria without authorization, and so did many of my colleagues. I am standing up again now because the administration’s reckless actions have brought us to the precipice of war.

Mr. Bolton and Secretary Pompeo’s failed strategy has led directly to these heightened tensions, to the brink of war, with no benefits to show for their tactics.

The administration has reimposed and tightened sanctions on Iran three times—sanctions we agreed not to impose if Iran agreed not to develop nuclear capabilities.

Secretary Pompeo placed a dozen conditions on negotiations and then withdrew them.

Just this week, at the same time that Advisor Bolton claims we will talk with Iran anytime, the President sanctions the lead diplomat in Iran and tweets out his threat of obliteration, shutting the door on any diplomatic overtures.

This ping-pong diplomacy, manufactured crisis, and go-it-alone posture further diminish our world’s standing and credibility. None of the signatories to the Iran nuclear agreement, including our closest allies, backs us in what we are doing.

This reckless diplomacy is dangerously reminiscent of the run-up to war with Iraq. But any war with Iran, with its military capability, proxy forces, and a population of 80 million living in a geographically perilous region, would be more disastrous and more costly than Iraq. Yet we continue to march up to the brink.

According to the President’s tweet last week, he stopped a strike against Iran that he had already ordered because he learned at the last minute that 150 lives were at stake. I know I am not alone in being deeply alarmed at this decisionmaking—national security decisionmaking process. I know Members on both sides of the aisle share my concerns.

We must assert our constitutional authority. We must tell the President and affirm to the American people that we will assume our constitutional responsibility. And we must do so now before, through miscalculation, mis-

take, or misjudgment, our Nation finds itself in yet another endless war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, our Founders recognize that no decision carries more consequences than the decision of whether to go to war. They were well familiar with the carnage of human lives and blood, injuries, and treasure that our initial war, the War of Independence, brought.

As we stand here several hundred years later, we recognize the wars in between; that more than 400,000 Americans died in World War II, that more than 50,000 Americans died in the Vietnam war, and that more than 4,000 Americans died in the war in Iraq. Those are just some indications of the enormous impacts and consequences of a decision to go to war.

It was an issue that the Founders struggled with in a republic: Where should this immense power rest? Should it rest with one individual—the President—or are the consequences too great to have the judgment of a single person carry the decision to its completion?

After intense debate, after many arguments, the Founders became very clear that this power should never rest in the hands of a single person; that it should not just be one body but two bodies—the House and the Senate—that should weigh in on the issue of war. The consequences being so profound, they could not leave it to the idiosyncrasies or the biases or the misjudgment of a single individual.

It was in fact one of the defining arguments about the difference between a King and a President. A King could make that decision, with often horrific consequences for the people of the kingdom, but not in the United States of America. This is why it is so deeply embedded in our Constitution. In Article I, section 8, under the enumerated powers of Congress, are simply the words “to declare war.” That power is vested in Congress, not the President.

The Founders weighed in time and again about this. Turning to James Madison, the father of the Constitution, he commented:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war to the Legislature.

He went on:

The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.

Madison continues:

The executive has no right, in any case, to decide the question, whether there is or not cause for declaring war.

He was the father of our Constitution. That led to this document that vests the power to declare war with Congress, not the President.

George Washington, the father of our Nation, said: “The constitution vests



the power of declaring war in Congress; therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure.”

This was the Commander in Chief speaking. This was the hero of the American Revolution speaking. This was the man most trusted to be the first President of the United States, who was to steer the course and make sure the Presidency did not become a kingship. And his conclusion? “[T]herefore, no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have . . . authorized such a measure.”

This is enormously at odds with the vision our colleague from Arkansas presented on the floor—dismissing the role of Congress, dismissing the Constitution, and instead saying let the President, as Commander in Chief, do what he will. That was not the vision.

George Mason of Virginia—if you stand in DC, you can look across the Potomac River, and you can see a monument to George Mason. He made notes of the Constitutional Convention. George Mason remarked that he was “against giving the power of war to the executive” because the President “is not safely to be trusted with it.” That was the point, that no one individual, no matter how wise—not even a George Washington—could be trusted with this decision. George Washington, as President, agreed with this completely, that despite his expertise as a Commander in Chief, it was not to be the judgment of one person.

Thomas Jefferson, one of the most brilliant minds our country has ever produced, commented: “We have already given in example”—referring to the Constitution—“one effectual check to the dog of war by referring the power of letting him”—the dog of war—“loose from the Executive to the Legislative.” So he is commenting on the Constitution and saying: We have put a check on the dog of war by putting that power in the legislative body, not the executive.

Jefferson became President. Did he change his mind when he became President? His initial quote I gave you was from 1789, but later he became President of the United States. And what did he think then? He thought the same exact thing, just as President Washington had. Jefferson said: “Considering that Congress alone is constitutionally invested with the power of changing our condition from peace to war, I have thought it my duty to await their authority for using force in any degree which could be avoided”—his message to Congress in 1805.

He recognized what the Constitution did. Are we going to recognize the constitutional vision? Now, there may be folks in this Chamber who simply disagree with the Founders and say that Congress is too complicated, that the power to declare war and the power to go to war should be vested solely in the Commander in Chief. Well, then, come

and present a constitutional amendment on the floor of the U.S. Senate. You took an oath to the Constitution of the United States, and that oath says that power rests in this body.

If you want to change the Constitution, then, have the guts to come down here and propose doing so. I guarantee it will be roundly defeated because the wisdom of our Founders that it is a mistake to give the power of war to one person is wise and does stand the test of time.

Alexander Hamilton noted the following:

The Congress shall have the power to declare war; the plain meaning of which is, that it is the peculiar and exclusive duty of Congress, when the Nation is at peace, to change that state into a state of war. . . .

Alexander Hamilton said: “exclusive duty of Congress” and “the plain meaning” of our Constitution.

This viewpoint continued to carry the day far into the future. Abraham Lincoln was speaking in 1848, and he said:

The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making powers to Congress, was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons.

Those are Lincoln’s words.

Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This, our [Constitutional] Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all Kingly oppressions and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us.

In the words of these great leaders of America—Washington, Hamilton, Mason, President Lincoln—all point to the power and wisdom of putting the decision about war with the House and the Senate, not the President.

Now, this resolution before us says: Mr. President, there is no foregoing authorization to go to war against Iran. It says: Any authorization has to come after debate specifically on that topic.

And why is this? Because we have heard from the administration that they want to use the 2001 authorization for the use of military force, an authorization specifically about al-Qaida in Afghanistan, to authorize war with Iran. Nothing could be more convoluted, and that is why we need to stand up and say: That is wrong. That is not right.

Anyone who pays even just a modicum of attention knows that the resolution to take on al-Qaida in Afghanistan is very different than going to war against the Shiite Islam nation of Iran. But we have to say it because the administration has been trying to prepare the case saying this 2001 resolution somehow has a link that authorizes war.

And why are we so concerned at this moment? Why are we here on the floor in this debate? Well, it is because the drums of war are beating loudly. It is because the President has deployed the *Abraham Lincoln* carrier strike force to the Gulf to threaten Iran. It is because

the President has preplaced a squadron of B-52 bombers to be ready to bomb Iran. Why are we so concerned—when we have a National Security Advisor who has said that no agreement can ever be reached with Iran and we have to bomb them and when we have a Secretary of State who says that no one has ever stood up to Iran and we have to teach them a lesson, or words to that effect, and we have a President who has proceeded to say that any attack will be met by great and overwhelming force?

So envision these preplaced forces. And, in fact, the President has declared that a section of the Iranian military, the Revolutionary Guard is a terrorist force. Add all of that up, and the President is talking about looking for a trigger to apply great and overwhelming force. That is why we are here. A response in proportion to defend a direct attack on the United States is authorized by the War Powers Act. That is honored by the resolution that is before us, the Udall-Paul-Kaine amendment that is before us. That is honored. But as for the use of great and overwhelming force the President is threatening, that is war. That has to come before this body.

The President went on and said: “In some areas, overwhelming will mean obliteration.” So for any attack? And we have heard the Secretary of State say if there is a Shiite force in Iraq that we can tie to Shiites in Iran and some communication, we will consider that an attack by Iran—looking for a trigger to go to war. And the President has said any act will be met with overwhelming force.

Not under our Constitution. You want that authority? You come here. You want to change the Constitution? Then, come here. I say this to my fellow Senators: Do you want to change the Constitution? Bring your amendment to the floor of the Senate to change the Constitution.

The Constitution speaks clearly. The President has no authority to apply overwhelming force or obliterating force and conduct a war against Iran. Make your case here or honor the Constitution.

We are in a troubling and difficult time, and I would like to see every Member of the Senate down here talking to each other about this. That is the gravity of the consequences. It is not a few Members who are here to stand up for our Constitution and the vision of wisdom in our Constitution. This is the time, before there is that trigger in which the President responds with great and overwhelming force and before he responds with obliterating force. Now is the time to pass this amendment put together in a bipartisan fashion that lays out the fundamental requirements of our Constitution and the fundamental requirements embraced by the Founders and the fundamental requirements repeated and honored by the greatest Presidents who have ever served our Nation.

Let us not allow the vision of our Constitution to be shredded. Let us honor our responsibility when we took an oath in office to defend it, and let us honor the wisdom of holding that debate on the floor, should the President ever ask us for such authorization to go to war against Iran.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

MILITARY WIDOW'S TAX ELIMINATION ACT

Mr. JONES. Madam President, I approach to say how much I appreciate my colleagues, Senator MERKLEY and Senator KAINE, for their eloquent thoughts on an important issue of our time.

Let me also now rise in total frustration on a completely different issue—but total frustration, bafflement, and, quite frankly, just angry and disappointed in this body. I am angry because we have turned our back for over 40 years on military families. We have turned our backs on the widows of the very men and women who have given their lives to protect this country, to uphold our democratic ideals, and to make possible the very work that we are doing in the Senate and the very work that we, as Members of the Senate and as Members of Congress, are charged to do every day on behalf of the American people and, particularly, on behalf of veterans and their families.

I am talking about this body's refusal to bring up the Military Widow's Tax Elimination Act—the refusal to bring it up for a single floor vote—despite the fact that we have 75 cosponsors—75 cosponsors of this bill. It is the most bipartisan legislation, except for the robocall bill, which everybody could agree on. And we can't get that to a vote in this body?

Where have we gone wrong? Where have the rules of the body—the rules that the leadership of both parties are operating under—gone off the rails that we can't bring this to a vote, to just get a simple up-or-down vote, on a process that is ripe, and that is the NDAA?

In my 17 or 18 months—I forget how many now in this body—I have had some frustrating moments, as I know all of my colleagues who have been here for a long time have had a lot of frustrating moments. We have shut down this government three times since I have been a U.S. Senator—three times. I have seen disaster relief held up for 5 or 6 months, with farmers and others needing that relief, needing that money, needing that help, and we held it up for political reasons so that someone can score a point because everything is seen through the eyes of a political gamesmanship. That is how we are operating today, and it is incredibly frustrating for those of us who want to make sure we go forward with things when we see bipartisan efforts.

In this situation, we are talking about military families who are getting ripped off by us. You can call it

the government if you want to, but at the end of the day, they are getting ripped off by every single Member of this body and the House of Representatives, and they have had it. It is no wonder that the American people think that Congress and Washington, in general, are just completely broken. If we can't fight for military widows and spouses, who are having their survivor benefits shortchanged, then, for whom are we going to fight? For whom are we going to stand up?

We always talk about standing up for the least of these. I have people wanting to stand up for the immigrants coming across the border. I have people wanting to stand up for corporations and to make sure that they are paying their share of the taxes, as opposed to overburden. I have people standing up for people every day, but here we have a chance to stand up for people who have given their lives for this country, and we are not doing it. We are not doing it.

If we can't do the right thing on this, with 75 cosponsors, how can we possibly tackle immigration reform? How can we possibly tackle healthcare reform or education in this country if we can't come to some agreement and one simple vote when we have 75 cosponsors?

How can we not fight for people like Cathy Milford, a retired schoolteacher from Mobile, AL, whose husband passed away unexpectedly 25 years ago from a service-connected illness just months after his retirement from the Coast Guard? Instead of a long and happy retirement together, Cathy has been fighting to right this wrong for all of the some 65,000 military spouses who are hurt by the current law.

During a recent visit here to Capitol Hill, she said: "Every time I talk about this"—and she is up here a lot talking about elimination of the military widow's tax—"I have to dig up my husband and bury him all over again."

Just think about that. Let that just sink in a minute: a military widow, one of many of thousands, who had to return to lobby Congress year after year at their own expense, saying she feels like she is digging up and burying her husband all over again when she has to talk about this issue. That is not only sad, it is shameful.

We have tried to pass this legislation. The Senate has, in some form, repeatedly over the last almost 20 years. It has been included in the NDAA numerous times only to be stripped out during conference. It has been included without an immediate pay-for to offset the budget issues that everybody kind of falls back on and hangs their hat on. We don't have that immediate pay-for.

It has passed before. It has passed before in this body with bipartisan support, but for some reason it just hasn't been able to get across the finish line. For some reason, even though the bill today has historic levels of cosponsorship, we are not allowed to bring it up for a vote as an amendment to this

NDAA. Frankly, that is the frustration.

It is a frustration that goes beyond just this bill. It is a frustration that we can't debate on the floor of the Senate anymore. We can't bring up amendments. I think we have brought up one amendment in legislation in this Congress because of the rule between the leader and minority leader. There are all these deals going on. You have to have a Republican package; you have to have a Democratic package; you have to play one against the other. We are constantly playing the political games in this body when we should be working for the American people as a whole.

That is why today, at this time, I am once again calling for our bill to eliminate the military widow's tax, to pass it or get it voted on and bring it to the floor and pass it on unanimous consent. Every one of my colleagues would do well to remember that we are the ones who should be fighting for these spouses. We are the ones. We are the only people they can turn to. This can't be fixed on the streets. It can't be fixed at the Department of Defense or the Veterans' Administration. The legislature, the Congress of the United States, is the only one that can do it, and we are the ones who should be fighting for these military spouses, the widows and widowers whose loved ones gave their lives for this country, the widows and widowers whose lives are forever changed because of their family's selfless service to this country.

Caring for military families has long been part of the foundation of our government. In President Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural address, he spoke in no uncertain terms on this obligation. In the midst of the Civil War, he addressed a nation that had sustained unimaginable loss—unimaginable loss—in order to preserve the Union we so cherish.

The country was then more divided than it ever had been, and God help us if it ever gets that divided again, but the values Lincoln asserted during that speech were so fundamental that, even at war with itself, it could agree on the importance.

He said this:

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan, to do all which we may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Let me repeat that critical phrase today: ". . . to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan."

This is the promise we have made to those who raise their hand in service to our Nation. This is the contract, the solemn contract, that we have made to those who have raised their hand in service to this Nation; that we will honor and support them and care for their families if tragedy occurs.

President Lincoln was assassinated just over a month after he issued this appeal, but the weight of his words still resonate today. In some ways, on this issue, they resonate more because in those days you could count on the fact that the legislative body, the Congress of the United States, heeded those words and took care of those families.

It has been 154 years since President Lincoln spoke those words; yet the Government of the United States, the Members of this body, the Members of the House have yet to fulfill that promise. It has been 154 years, and we still get caught up in the deals that are made as to what gets on the floor and what does not get on the floor, the political deals that have to be jockeyed, where we give and take, and it is one over the other. We need to fix that today.

We need to fix it in a broader sense and let this body get back to its real work and be the great deliberative body it is supposed to be. We are not doing that, but that is a different issue for a different time.

Let's start today and stand up and exhibit just a fraction, a small fraction—a small, small fraction—of the courage that these military spouses did on our behalf. Let's let our actions speak louder than words simply ever could. Let's put the issue to rest and give these widows some peace.

Let us do our duty.

It was Atticus Finch, who told the jury in "To Kill a Mockingbird," as he closed out, knowing what the outcome was going to be, as I do here—knowing what the outcome was going to be, it was Atticus Finch, who said: "In the name of God, do your duty."

I say that to this body. I say that to the leadership. In the name of God, let's do our duty to these people. Let's get behind the political deals and let's do our duty, once and for all.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT  
NO. 269

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to set aside the pending amendment; that amendment No. 269 be considered and agreed to; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, reserving the right, let me share a story of something that happened.

The timing sometimes happens at very inconvenient times, but on September 7, 2011, I was in my State of Oklahoma and was in Collinsville, OK. Probably not many people have been to Collinsville, OK, but I have. It was the home of a really beloved individual and family. The family was the Chris Horton family, and the wife was Jane Horton.

I remember it so well. This was September 7, 2011. I was talking to the group, and I was telling them that I

was preparing to make one of my regular trips to Afghanistan. At that time, I was not chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, but I was a high-ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In the audience was Jane Horton, and Jane said: Well, if you are going to go over there, why don't you go by and see my husband, Chris? I said: I will do it. I found out his whereabouts, exactly where he was. I got over there to look up Chris, only to find out that 2 days after I made that commitment in Collinsville, OK, that Chris died in action. Chris died in action. I was the one who had to call on and share that with his wife, Jane Horton.

In fact, after that, we hired Jane to go around and help us with the widows' benefits. Starting at that time, I was the leader and continued to be a leader long before the Senator from Alabama was into this, and he will agree that I was actively working on this issue.

I support and will continue to support the permanent fix. It is going to happen. We are going to do it. In fact, I am the first Senate Armed Services chairman to cosponsor this legislation.

Mr. JONES mentioned there were 75 people who cosponsored it. That is I. I was on there on the initial legislation and will continue to be and will always be, and that reflects my commitment to the permanent fix.

Here is the problem we have. There has to be a fix, but it can't be on this bill. The reason it can't be on this bill is because it has a mandatory spending that has no offset, and there is not an exception to this on the bill. This is part of the agreement in bringing the bill up.

Now, what we can do is go ahead and do what is necessary with this very popular cause, and I will be standing with the Senator from Alabama to make sure this happens.

Let's assume that were not true, that we couldn't do it under the rules. Under the rules, there is another rule that, if there is an objection to any amendments coming up, then I, as the chairman of the committee, if the party objecting is not here, I have to offer his objection.

There is an objection to this, and I will therefore object and be in the strongest position of helping this to become a reality. I owe it not just to the many people I know but also to the family whom I just referred to from Collinsville.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES. I thank my friend and colleague Chairman INHOFE, and let me say I know where he has been on this issue. I have seen his speeches from years past on this issue, and I do appreciate that, and I appreciate the fact that he is a cosponsor.

I also know this has been put on an NDAA before in this body without a pay-for, without an offset, in order to have a sense of the Senate and to go on

record, and that is what I think we should do. I understand we are not there this year for whatever reason. I still believe, in part, that it is a procedural issue that ought to be put aside for this, but that is an argument for another day.

I do so very much appreciate the chairman's remarks. I have enjoyed working with him, Senator REED, and others on the NDAA. That has been an effort. I told folks back home and across the country where I have spoken that I wish people could have actually seen what happened in that markup behind closed doors and the bipartisanship that the chairman showed and the other Senators showed. I wish people could have seen it because we don't get to see it. I don't think if we opened it up that we would have seen it, but it was remarkable.

So we are where we are in the Senate. I understand that, and I knew that coming in here. I will simply say this. The House of Representatives is also going to take up the NDAA, and I hope my colleagues on the other side of the wonderful Capitol are listening. Put it in. It is not in the committee bill. Put it in. Bring it to conference because, if it gets to conference, I am going to continue to have this in this NDAA, and let's get this done, once and for all.

Thank you, Chairman INHOFE, and thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS  
BILLS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if I might, let me describe where things are in the state of play with respect to the supplemental appropriations bill that deals with the border.

I know the situation at our border has been at a crisis point for weeks now. Our agencies are stretched to the breaking point, struggling to care for the overwhelming flow of migrants; yet we have House Democrats continuing to play politics with the border funding bill.

Again, to describe the state of play, we had a request from the President 7 weeks ago for \$4.5 billion to address this humanitarian crisis we are having at our southern border, and the Democrats didn't act on it. They described it as a manufactured crisis. When I say the Democrats, I am talking about the House Democrats, which is where most spending bills originate.

After the House failed to act and failed to respond to the President's request for emergency funding, the Senate decided to act. So the Senate Appropriations Committee took up and passed a bipartisan bill out of the Appropriations Committee by a vote of 30 to 1—not a vote that you see all that often around here these days.

So that bill was reported out to the floor. In the meantime, the House Democrats decided that maybe it wasn't, after all, a manufactured crisis and perhaps they needed to act. So

they picked up a bill—a partisan bill—and passed it out of the House of Representatives on a party-line basis, after which the Senate voted on its bill, the bill I mentioned that was reported out of the Appropriations Committee by a vote of 30 to 1, and it came to the floor where it passed yesterday by a vote of 84 to 8—84 to 8 in the U.S. Senate.

Well, just to demonstrate that the bipartisan bill passed by the Senate is the vehicle that should move forward and should go to the President for his signature, the President had indicated he would veto the House-passed bill, but we took it up. We took up the House-passed bill yesterday on the floor of the U.S. Senate. We had a vote on it. It got 37 votes here on the floor of the Senate—not nearly enough, obviously, to pass the Senate. Of course, it was going to meet a certain veto by the President even if it had.

That being said, there were 37 votes for the House-passed partisan bill that came out of the House of Representatives. Here on the floor of the Senate, there were 84 votes for the bipartisan bill produced by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Where we are right now is that was sent back to the House. The House, frankly, should just take up that bill and pass it. We know for certain the President would sign it. Again, I think it demonstrates a body of work that reflects the will of both sides, Republicans and Democrats—certainly in the Senate—to get a vote of 30 to 1 out of the Appropriations Committee or 84 to 8 on the floor of the Senate. You had to have a high level of bipartisan cooperation.

That bill to address the humanitarian crisis at our border is awaiting action by the House of Representatives. All they have to do is simply pick it up and pass it and send it to the President, where it will be signed into law, and we will get much needed resources and much needed manpower to the southern border, where they desperately need it. I hope that will be the case.

We are being told that the House is now considering sending yet another partisan bill over here to the Senate. The only thing I can tell you is, if you want to get legislation signed into law by the President of the United States that actually does deliver and put the much needed assistance on the ground that is desperately needed on the southern border, the only surefire way to do that right now is for the House to pick up the Senate-passed bill, which passed here with 84 votes, pass it, and send it to the President, where it will be signed into law, and that \$4.5 billion will be on its way to the border to assist with all the needs down there that are currently being unmet. I hope that can happen yet today.

That is the state of play with respect to the supplemental appropriations bill.

## DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. President, I think 2019 is going to go down in history for the Democratic Party. It has been a notable year.

While the Democratic Party has obviously always been left of center, I never expected to see the Democratic Party running so far to the left of the American people or wholeheartedly embracing socialism and a government takeover of a large part of the economy.

The socialist fantasies are rapidly piling up: a government takeover of healthcare, a government takeover of the energy sector, government-funded college, a government writeoff of all student loan debts, guaranteed income, government-guaranteed housing, and on and on. So what is wrong with that? After all, those proposals sound really nice—free healthcare, free college, the government guaranteeing you an income. Here is the problem: Providing all that stuff is going to cost a lot of money, an almost inconceivable amount of money. Somebody is going to have to pay. You might say that obviously the government is going to pay, but the government has to get its money from somewhere. Here is the catch: The government gets its money from the taxpayers.

Can't we just take that money from rich taxpayers? If you talk to some of the socialist Democrats offering these proposals, they will talk about making the rich pay. The rich are their favorite funding mechanism. Want free college? We just get the rich to pay for it. Want free healthcare? We can just get the rich to pay for it. There is just one big problem with that: There aren't enough rich people in America to even come close to paying for Democrats' socialist fantasies. Deep down, Democrats know it, which is why they tend to get very foggy when pressed on the details of how they are going to pay for some of their plans.

Take the junior Senator from Vermont's proposal of a government takeover of America's health insurance, the so-called Medicare for All plan. A conservative estimate puts the cost of that plan at \$32 trillion over 10 years. The current cost is likely much higher since the Senator from Vermont's most recent plan for government-run healthcare also includes long-term care, which we all know is an incredibly expensive benefit.

The Senator from Vermont did release a list of proposed tax hikes to pay for his proposal. The only problem is, the tax hikes wouldn't come close to covering the estimated cost of his original Medicare for All plan, much less the cost of his new expanded Medicare fantasy.

Of course, as staggering as the costs of Medicare for All would be—more money than the Federal Government spent in the last 8 years combined on everything—they pale in comparison to the cost of the so-called Green New Deal. An initial estimate found that the Green New Deal would cost some-

where between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion over 10 years—\$93 trillion. That is more money than the 2017 gross domestic product for the entire world. That is right. You could take the entire economic output of every country in the world in 2017, and it still might not pay for the Democrats' socialist fantasy. Once you realize that, it is pretty obvious that the Green New Deal is not a plan that could be paid for by taxing the rich.

How about taxing every household making more than \$200,000 a year at a 100-percent rate for 10 years? That wouldn't even get you close to \$93 trillion. How about taxing every household making more than \$100,000 at a 100-percent rate for 10 years? That wouldn't get you anywhere close to \$93 trillion. Like Medicare for All, the Green New Deal would be paid for on the backs of working families.

I have talked a lot about the money aspect of Democrats' socialist proposals, and that is one of the major problems with these proposals—they sound nice until you realize that actually nothing is really free. Working Americans are still going to be paying for the cost of all those programs through new and much higher taxes.

But that is far from the only problem with some of the Democrats' socialist fantasies. Leaving aside the fact that the Federal Government is not exactly known for its efficiency or bringing programs in on time and on budget, there is the tremendous cost Americans will pay in the loss of their freedom, the loss of their autonomy. Americans are used to choices and being able to make their own decisions. It is part of our heritage. Those are freedoms we cherish. That is not the way things work under socialism.

Nowhere is this more obvious than with Medicare for All. Medicare for All doesn't give Americans health insurance options; it takes them away. Are you part of the majority of Americans who are happy with their current healthcare? Too bad. Medicare for All eliminates all private insurance plans and replaces them with a single, government-run, one-size-fits-all plan. Under Medicare for All, private health insurance plans as we know them would actually be illegal. If you are not happy with the government-run plan, too bad; you won't have any other choices.

The treatment options would also be limited by what the government decides. If the government doesn't want to pay for a particular cancer treatment, for example, as has happened in other countries with socialized medicine, you will be out of luck.

Then, of course, there are the long wait times that are the hallmark of socialized medicine. Imagine having to wait months for diagnostic imaging or needed surgery or having to stand by while your spouse or child is forced to wait months for care. That is the kind of thing Americans would have to look forward to under Medicare for All.

Margaret Thatcher once said that the problem with socialism is that eventually you run out of other people's money. Once Democrats have taken every dollar they can from the rich to pay for their socialist fantasies, they will come after the paychecks of ordinary Americans, who will face higher and higher taxes for fewer and fewer benefits and greatly reduced choices. Democrats' socialist dreams would quickly trap the American people in a nightmare.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, before I deliver comments on a bill that I am introducing, let me express my disappointment that the Senate will not be voting today on the amendment that Senator JONES and I have filed to eliminate the military widow's tax. This is a tremendous inequity, as is recognized by the fact that 75 of our colleagues have cosponsored our freestanding bill.

Nevertheless, I am heartened by the commitment and the compassion of the Senate Armed Services Committee chairman, Senator INHOFE, who has indicated his receptivity to dealing with this issue but in a different way on a different bill. I hope that today is just a temporary setback and that we can see this bill taken up as a freestanding bill by the entire Senate.

Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be received and appropriately referred.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2018 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mrs. MURRAY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2008 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

S. 1790

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to explain the context in which I will vote for the Romney amendment.

First, I am grateful for Senator ROMNEY's substantive contributions and his collegiality as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The plain text of the amendment states the obvious—that funds authorized by the NDAA may be used to ensure the ability of our Armed Forces to defend themselves and U.S. citizens.

I believe every Member of this body certainly shares the fundamental un-

derstanding that our Armed Forces must have the ability to defend themselves and our citizens against foreign enemies. Indeed, the purpose of the NDAA is to provide the authorizations that are necessary to ensure the Department of Defense is in a position to defend the United States and our citizens.

In my opinion, in that respect, this amendment is not necessary. For anyone who argues that the Romney language is somehow necessary because of the Udall amendment that we will be voting on tomorrow, I say reread the Udall amendment. It includes an explicit exception for self-defense.

I am concerned that this administration will seek to twist the Romney amendment into something that is completely unrecognizable, something that we are not voting on today, and something that has no basis in law. As a legal matter, the amendment does nothing more than to explicitly provide the authority to use funds under the act to ensure this ability.

Let me be clear. This amendment does nothing more than that. Either implicitly or explicitly, it does not authorize the use of military force. Let me repeat. It is not an AUMF. An explicit authorization would have to come to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee following serious and substantive engagement by the executive branch.

It is no secret that there are some in this administration who are eager to engage militarily with Iran. This week, the President himself argued that he does not have to go to Congress to seek authorization. But those who don't want to completely bypass our congressional prerogative will be grasping at any purported source of authority that could justify, in their minds, that Congress has authorized these actions.

Look no further than the Secretary of State, who is purportedly pushing the bogus legal theory that the 2001 AUMF, which Congress passed in the wake of 9/11, somehow provides authority to use force against Iran. Apparently, Secretary Pompeo is not dissuaded by the facts. The plain language of the 2001 AUMF does not extend to Iran. Congress did not intend for the 2001 AUMF to cover Iran, and neither Republican nor Democratic Presidents who have operated pursuant to this AUMF have claimed such authority.

Against this backdrop and a President who has evaded Congress in unprecedented and unlawful ways, we must make crystal clear that the Romney amendment cannot be abused by those in this administration who appear to be desperate to build a case that the President has all of the authority he needs to take us into war with Iran.

We cannot leave anything up to chance when it comes to the choice of whether we send our sons and daughters into war. I believe we should be having a serious conversation about our use of military force and about

what constitutes self-defense and attacks on our allies.

I am pleased that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has previously committed to holding these hearings, and I believe we should commence with hearings with multiple stakeholders, including the administration itself. Previous administrations have sent up representatives to explain to Congress their rationale for war or to explain the type of authorizations they are seeking. We should demand nothing less from this administration.

I support the amendment, and I look forward to continuing appropriate oversight over the executive branch's pursuit of military action around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I thank my esteemed friend and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee for his kind words in support of my amendment.

As we debate the Defense Authorization Act today, one of our most pressing concerns is how we deter Iran from further escalating its attacks. The decisions we make on this bill will have a direct bearing on the options the President and the military have available to keep our military, our citizens, and our friends and allies safe.

The Senate is poised to vote soon on my amendment, No. 861. It would reaffirm what has long been American policy. Our military is authorized to defend itself and to protect our citizens. Enacting this amendment makes it clear to our military, as well as to any potential adversary, that America does not shrink in the face of attack. This is not an authorization to use military force against Iran or anyone else; it is a statement of continued commitment to our national defense.

Under the Constitution, only Congress may declare war, but also under the Constitution, the President can defend against attacks and can respond in an appropriate manner to an attack that has been made.

As we all know, my esteemed colleague from New Mexico, Senator UDALL, has proposed an amendment on a related topic which I wish to briefly address.

We do not need the Udall amendment to tell us what the Constitution already demands—that Congress alone can declare war. His amendment is clearly intended to limit the President in some other ways that he has not yet explained to this body.

As it is written, the Udall amendment would dramatically limit the existing authority that the Constitution provides to the President to respond to Iran. It would prevent the President

from defending U.S. citizens, U.S. interests, and our allies. This is not only my opinion; it is the carefully considered conclusion of the U.S. Department of Defense.

In its letter on June 26 to Chairman INHOFE, it states this, referring to the Udall amendment:

“The Department strongly opposes this amendment . . . At a time when Iran is engaging in escalating military provocation . . . this amendment could embolden Iran to further provocations.”

Tying the President’s hands in some undefined way in the midst of the current crisis is misguided, dangerous, and surely sends the wrong message to both Iran and to our allies.

Last week, the Iranians continued their provocative escalation in the Middle East. After weeks of buildup in which Iran attacked six commercial ships, and its proxies bombed an oil pipeline and launched a rocket into a commercial Saudi Arabian airport, Iran shot down an American drone over international waters.

The Udall amendment raises serious questions about how the military could respond to these attacks after the fact. Could we fire on the missile launcher that downed our drone? Could we sink one of their small, outboard motor vessels that attached the mines to the ships that were attacked?

Imagine for a moment that in the future, another American aircraft, perhaps one that is manned by an American pilot, were to be shot down by an Iranian rocket. It is possible that the Udall amendment would limit our military’s options to subsequently respond to such an outrage.

I don’t pretend to know whether Iran will continue its pattern of aggression, but I do know that when bad actors think they can escape consequence for malevolent acts, such acts are more likely to occur in the future.

I am glad that Senator UDALL’s revised amendment concedes the broad point that our military has the inherent right of self-defense. But in the case of a rocket hitting one of our planes, the President should not have his hands tied in responding after such an attack in an appropriate manner.

Note also that while the Udall amendment provides for the military to defend itself from attack, it does not provide for the defense of our citizens. Iran could take this as an invitation to attack Americans abroad.

Further, it would prohibit our military from defending or responding to an attack by Iran on our Iraqi partners so long as it didn’t directly hit American troops. Passing the Udall amendment would effectively give a green light to Iranian forces to carry out attacks in Iraq so long as they don’t attack U.S. forces.

If Iran were to attack Israel, one of our NATO allies, the Udall amendment would not allow the President to respond.

Finally, by carving out Iranian territory, the Udall amendment would po-

tentially prevent us from pursuing and taking out terrorists who seek refuge in Iran.

I oppose the Udall amendment not because I want to go to war with Iran or rush to respond without carefully evaluating our long-term strategy to counter Iranian aggression. I know no one who wants to go to war with Iran.

I fully concur with my many Senate colleagues who desire to reassert the constitutional role of Congress in declaring war. But to engage in this effort now, and in an undefined way, and then to attach that to Iran when Iran has just shot down an American aircraft would send a terrible message to the Ayatollahs and to the world.

I mean, think about it. Iran shoots down an American aircraft, and what does the U.S. Senate rush to do? It rushes to vote in some undefined way to restrict military consequence. That is simply unthinkable.

My amendment is not about Iran. It does not even mention Iran. My amendment is about affirming the constitutional authorities that any President must have to properly protect and defend this Nation.

As the Department of Defense maintains, the President of the United States must always have the option of responding to attacks by Iran or anyone else at a time and place of our choosing—today and in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

**CLOTURE MOTION**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

**CLOTURE MOTION**

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 764, as modified, to S. 1790, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

James M. Inhofe, Roger F. Wicker, Johnny Isakson, Steve Daines, Roy Blunt, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, Deb Fischer, Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, John Thune, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis, John Boozman.

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 amendment No. 764, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, as modified, to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths

for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 186 Leg.]

**YEAS—87**

Alexander	Feinstein	Peters
Baldwin	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Reed
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blumenthal	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hassan	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rosen
Braun	Heinrich	Rubio
Brown	Hirono	Sasse
Burr	Hoeven	Schatz
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Carper	Johnson	Shaheen
Casey	Jones	Shelby
Cassidy	Kaine	Sinema
Collins	Kennedy	Smith
Coons	King	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Moran	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murray	Wicker
Ernst	Perdue	Young

**NAYS—7**

Booker	Markey	Wyden
Klobuchar	Merkley	
Lee	Paul	

**NOT VOTING—6**

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Gillibrand	Rounds	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 7.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

**AMENDMENT NOS. 864, 863, AND 862 WITHDRAWN**

Under the previous order, amendment Nos. 864, 863, and 862 are withdrawn.

The Democratic leader.

**AMENDMENT NO. 861**

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes, equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am voting in favor of the Romney amendment, No. 861, because it does nothing more than restate the longstanding principle that the Armed Forces of the United States have the ability to defend themselves and citizens of the United States from foreign attack. The

amendment does not constitute an authorization to use military force, nor is there anything in the amendment that confers any new authority on the President.

As Senator ROMNEY, the author of the amendment, stated on the floor a half-hour ago, “[t]his [amendment] is not an authorization to use military force against Iran or anyone else. . . . Under the Constitution, only Congress may declare war.”

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I will reassert the same thing I just heard from the minority leader. I appreciate his words.

This amendment would reaffirm a basic principle. The United States has the right to defend itself and our citizens when attacked. It asserts what has always been a bedrock constitutional principle. This is not an AUMF. It is not an authorization for the use of military force.

Passing my amendment today would send a strong signal to our adversaries that we will defend ourselves if our interests, our people, our military, our allies are threatened and attacked.

My amendment is something that I believe everyone in this body can and should support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the motion to recommit and the amendments pending thereto fall.

All postcloture time is expired.

The question is on agreeing to amendment (No. 861), offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, on behalf of the Senator from Utah, Mr. ROMNEY.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 187 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Capito	Crapo
Baldwin	Cardin	Cruz
Barrasso	Carper	Daines
Blackburn	Casey	Durbin
Blumenthal	Cassidy	Enzi
Blunt	Collins	Ernst
Boozman	Cooms	Feinstein
Braun	Cornyn	Fischer
Brown	Cortez Masto	Gardner
Burr	Cotton	Graham
Cantwell	Cramer	Grassley

Hassan	Menendez	Scott (FL)
Hawley	Merkley	Scott (SC)
Heinrich	Moran	Shaheen
Hoeben	Murkowski	Shelby
Hyde-Smith	Murphy	Sinema
Inhofe	Murray	Smith
Isakson	Paul	Stabenow
Johnson	Perdue	Sullivan
Jones	Peters	Tester
Kaine	Portman	Thune
Kennedy	Reed	Tillis
King	Risch	Toomey
Klobuchar	Roberts	Udall
Lankford	Romney	Van Hollen
Lee	Rosen	Warner
Manchin	Rubio	Whitehouse
Markey	Sasse	Wicker
McConnell	Schatz	Wyden
McSally	Schumer	Young

NAYS—4

Booker	Hirono
Duckworth	Leahy

NOT VOTING—6

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Gillibrand	Rounds	Warren

The amendment (No. 861) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes on the NDAA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1790

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the importance of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 legislation that authorizes \$750 billion for defense, consistent with the administration's budget request and the National Defense Strategy Commission report.

The NDAA is a critical piece of legislation. It supports our Armed Forces, our men and women in uniform, and provides for the defense of our Nation. Among its notable provisions, the bill supports a 3.1-percent pay increase for the members of our armed services, the largest in nearly a decade and very much deserved by the men and women in uniform who protect us.

It establishes a Space Force and ensures that America retains its leadership in this critical domain. It opens the way for significant investments in new weapons systems, such as hypersonic missiles and directed energy weapons along with missile defense and cyber security capabilities. It also responds to concerns about family housing across the Department of Defense.

Importantly, the bill continues to provide for the modernization of our nuclear forces. This legislation fully authorizes fiscal year 2020 spending on our nuclear deterrent, including support for all three legs of the Nation's nuclear triad. It also fully authorizes the warhead life extension programs at the Department of Energy.

I want to highlight a couple of amendments I worked on and are included in the legislation relative to modernizing our nuclear triad. One of the amendments that has been included requires that the Air Force and the National Nuclear Security Administration report to Congress on the de-

velopment of the next intercontinental ballistic missile and the W87-1, which is a modified warhead that will be placed on the new ICBM for decades to come.

It is vital that the Air Force's missile development program, known as the Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent, GBSD, be synchronized with the W87-1 warhead so that a decade from now, we have a complete new weapons system that is ready for deployment. My amendment will help ensure that the deployment will happen on schedule and avoid unnecessary delays in that development.

The other amendment highlights the importance of our Nation's ICBM force and demonstrates how ICBMs enhance deterrence as a part of the triad. ICBMs provide the most prompt and most dispersed segment of our nuclear forces, and they magnify the deterrent power of our nuclear triad.

I commend my colleagues for their support of these amendments, which is a strong statement of the continuing importance of the ICBM and the need to ensure that it is modernized along with the rest of our nuclear forces in order to keep us safe.

The bill is also critically important for military activities in my home State of North Dakota. Specifically, we worked to secure a number of provisions to support the missions at the Minot Air Force Base, which is home to two of the three legs of the nuclear triad. Importantly, the NDAA authorizes funding for B-52s, including the procurement of new engines. As a member of the Senate Defense Appropriations Committee, I have worked to authorize and appropriate money for new engines which will help modernize the B-52 and extend its life for years to come.

The NDAA also advances replacement of the Vietnam-era Huey helicopters that provide security for the missile fields, and it supports the construction of a new helicopter facility at Minot to house the Huey replacement. It also makes a strong commitment to the Long-Range Stand Off, LRSO, Program that will provide a new nuclear cruise missile for the B-52, as well as continuing to advance the investments in GBSD.

The bill also supports priorities at Grand Forks Air Force Base, which is home to the Global Hawk, which provides important intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities for the Air Force. In fact, it was the Navy version of the Global Hawk which was recently shot down in the Strait of Hormuz by Iran.

The bill authorizes more than \$240 million for the Global Hawk Program and more than \$115 million for the Battlefield Airborne Communications Node that is carried on the Global Hawk Block 20 aircraft. These investments in the Global Hawk have been a priority because the Global Hawk BACN system is urgently needed to provide communications support for operations around the world.

Finally, I would like to emphasize support for items that some of my colleagues put forward that I think are critically important both for my State and for the Nation as a whole.

I am pleased to cosponsor an amendment from Senator GRAHAM that commits us over the next decade to building our capacity to produce plutonium pits. We must build up this capacity so we can extend the life of our nuclear stockpile and preserve our nuclear deterrent in the future.

I also cosponsored an amendment from Senator MURKOWSKI that requires the Defense Department to report on Russian and Chinese activities in the Arctic, which is an area of the world where we need to build up our capabilities in the coming years.

I would similarly express my support for Senator HAWLEY's amendment that requires a report from our military commanders on their ability to deter aggressive actions from Russia and China. I hope that can be included on this legislation as well.

The bill also includes an important provision from Senator KLOBUCHAR that I cosponsored to help ensure that the children of National Guard and Reserve servicemembers have access to additional support services in schools.

I cosponsored a provision from Senator BALDWIN, who joins me on the floor today, that will protect veterans' benefits if and when they have to file for bankruptcy. I am pleased to cosponsor her amendment.

All of these items demonstrate just what a large undertaking the National Defense Authorization Act really is. It includes thousands of provisions and represents a lot of work from many Members in support of our military servicemembers and their families.

I look forward to passing the legislation today and moving it to conference and getting it enacted into law for our men and women in uniform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

FOURTH OF JULY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I am so grateful we had the opportunity to be on the floor this week and to have a discussion about our Nation's security and how we protect and preserve freedom. I have just a couple of thoughts that I wanted to bring forward as we begin to think about July 4th and Independence Day and how we commemorate that day and do honor to the heritage and the tradition of that day and of the freedoms that we enjoy.

I came across something this week that I think is just so pertinent to our discussions of this week as we focus on freedom. In 1826, a very feeble and old John Adams received a group of Quincy, MA, town leaders. They were seeking his help in planning an anniversary celebration of the Declaration of Independence. They wanted the former President to pen a toast that would be read at the event. Imagine their sur-

prise when what they got from John Adams was two words. The toast that he penned for them was simply this: "Independence forever." It is what we had fought for, what had been won, what people had desired, and their passion—*independence*.

Keeping that independence is indeed the task. I am certain they wanted something much more ambitious and eloquent, but they simply got the nugget of what centered him and what should center us.

In the Declaration, our Founding Fathers recognized that "Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes," but that true liberty could not thrive in the grasp of tyranny.

Today, freedom reveals itself in the lives and actions of every American, and it is our responsibility to preserve it on the battlefield and through our actions each and every single day.

With every confirmation of a district or a circuit court judge, we preserve an essential right guaranteed by the First Amendment—the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Earlier this month, I introduced a resolution supporting free speech on college campuses because it is beyond distressing to hear students and their professors argue that encouraging the open exchange of ideas amounts to an act of violence. Our Founding Fathers probably never dreamed they would hear of such a thing. This proud hostility toward diversity of thought should serve as a reminder that questions of freedom rarely remain settled.

Last week, famed economist Dr. Art Laffer, who is a beloved Tennessean, was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom. The "father of supply-side economics" only became so because he was free to learn and apply the knowledge that he gained to his own groundbreaking work that led to the Laffer curve.

Looking beyond Washington, it is easy to see many more examples of freedom in action each and every day.

Every Tuesday, my friend and fellow Senator, LAMAR ALEXANDER, hosts "Tennessee Tuesday." This gives us an opportunity to meet with Tennesseans who have come to Washington. They are students, small businessmen, writers, and teachers. They have a host of talents that they share, and they have been allowed to invest in those talents.

Back home in Nashville, we enjoy the artistry of some of the world's most talented songwriters, singers, and producers. Guess what. In the United States of America, they do not have to go seek permission from any government official to write a song about a broken heart or any other act of injustice that they want to write that song about, sing that song about, or write that screenplay about.

The connections we form with each other—whether it be through art, song, or a conversation at a cash register—all run deep. The thoughts and emotions we experience when confronted

with provocative ideas are just as much a celebration of freedom as is a flag-raising ceremony or a fireworks display. This is why the very idea of censorship or a global standard of speech and association rouses immediate dissent.

We know that these collective understandings regarding a particular type of speech or behavior inevitably lead to collective insistence that the problems of the world could be resolved if only we could agree to compromise on the finer points of freedom. Those understandings assume that the intellectual comfort of the many simply must, just this once, override the ideas of the vocal minority.

As we prepare to leave Washington in anticipation of Independence Day, I would encourage my friends in Congress to challenge their own ideas of what freedom looks like. How do they exercise it and enjoy it every day? While John Adams probably never imagined a world of cable news and the comments sections, he provided us with the only context we need when confronted with the choice of preserving freedom or allowing it to slip away—his admonition: "Independence forever."

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE STONEWALL UPRISING

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to mark the 50th anniversary of a critical milestone in our Nation's march toward equality—the Stonewall uprising of June 28, 1969.

The Stonewall Inn, which opened in 1967 on Christopher Street in Greenwich Village in New York City, was one of many establishments in cities across this country that served as sanctuaries for members of the LGBTQ community from persecution by police and by society at large.

In the late 1960s, every State in America, save one, criminalized same-sex relationships. Many State and local governments also had harsh laws that restricted the ability of transgender people to express their identities, and LGBTQ people were prohibited from gathering socially. As a result, LGBTQ individuals in places like Stonewall Inn, where they gathered, were targeted frequently by law enforcement, including the New York City Police Department. However, by the late 1960s, LGBTQ individuals had already begun to stand up to police harassment, including at places like Cooper Do-nuts in Los Angeles in 1959, Compton's Cafeteria in San Francisco in 1966, and the Black Cat Tavern in Los Angeles in 1967.

In the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, the NYPD raided the Stonewall Inn and arrested several people, just as it had done repeatedly over the days, weeks, and months prior. But this night was different. A few brave individuals—particularly transgender women of color, like Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera—stood up and



fought back against this injustice. That night, they sparked an uprising against the NYPD with confrontations and protests at the Stonewall Inn and the surrounding area that lasted over the course of 6 days, until July 3, 1969.

The Stonewall uprising empowered thousands of LGBTQ individuals to emerge from shadows and to come out publicly as they stood up for their community the night of June 28, 1969, and beyond, putting their lives and their safety at risk.

Along with public protests in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Washington, DC, and elsewhere, the Stonewall uprising became a catalyst for the LGBTQ civil rights movement to secure social and political equality and inspired the formation of many advocacy organizations.

A year later, members of the LGBTQ community commemorated the first anniversary of Stonewall and reaffirmed the solidarity of the community by organizing the first Pride marches and events in New York City, San Francisco, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Now, we remember and celebrate the Stonewall uprising every year in June as Pride Month.

Three years ago, President Obama declared the Stonewall Inn and its surrounding area a national monument, becoming the first national monument to commemorate the LGBTQ civil rights movement.

Last month, New York City announced that it would dedicate a monument honoring pioneering transgender activists and key leaders in the Stonewall uprising, including Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera. It would be the first public monument in the world honoring transgender women.

Just a few weeks ago, the NYPD Commissioner issued an official apology on behalf of the department stating: “The actions taken by the NYPD were wrong—plain and simple.”

I was just a kid when the Stonewall uprising happened. I didn’t hear about Stonewall on the news or even learn about it later in my history class. It wasn’t until I was in college when, as a part of my own coming out process, I began to research the history of the gay rights movement and I learned more about the events at Stonewall, the people involved, and the movement that it created.

Five years after Stonewall, in 1974, Kathy Kozachenko became the first openly gay person elected to political office in the United States, winning a seat on the Ann Arbor City Council in Michigan. Three years later, in 1977, Harvey Milk was elected to the San Francisco City Council.

In 1986, I had the honor of winning election to the Dane County Board of Supervisors in Madison, WI. It was my first role in elected office, but I wasn’t the first. In fact, I was the third openly gay person to serve on the Dane Coun-

ty Board. I was really fortunate to have role models who had come before me.

In 1998, I became the first openly gay person elected to the U.S. House of Representatives as a nonincumbent, and, in 2012, I became the first out member of the LGBTQ community to be elected to the U.S. Senate in its history.

I remember my early years in public office when there were only about two dozen or so elected officials who were out across the country. We would meet on an annual basis to discuss how we could work together to exchange ideas about legislation that would advance equality, and we talked about how we would help to expand our numbers at the local, State, and national levels. I am proud to say that, today, there are more than 700 out LGBTQ people who are serving in elected office across the United States.

All of these public servants bring their unique life experiences to the job, and they give the LGBTQ community a seat at the table of our local, State, and Federal Governmental bodies. Perhaps just as importantly, each of these public servants is a role model for the next generation. This is important progress, but we are not there yet. We have more work to do, and we must keep fighting to move our country forward.

Members of the LGBTQ community continue to experience bias in policing and are still at significant risk of violence and discrimination. According to the annual hate crimes report, which is published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, LGBTQ individuals and, particularly, LGBTQ individuals of color continue to be the target of bias-motivated violence, but efforts to address this violence may be hindered by a continued lack of trust in law enforcement. At least 100 transgender people, primarily women of color, have been murdered in the United States since the beginning of 2015.

No LGBTQ person in the United States should have to live in fear of being the target of violence. In a majority of States in this country, LGBTQ Americans can still be fired, evicted from their homes, or denied services because of who they are or whom they love. Because there is no explicit, uniform Federal law protecting LGBTQ people from discrimination in education, employment, housing, credit, and more, too many Americans are at the mercy of an inadequate patchwork of State and local laws.

The House took a historic step forward last month when it passed the Equality Act. It is time for the Senate to do the same so that all LGBTQ Americans, no matter where they live, can finally have the freedom of full equality.

This week, I introduced a Senate resolution to honor the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall uprising. It is the first resolution in the U.S. Senate to recognize the story of Stonewall. This reso-

lution commends the bravery, solidarity, and resiliency of the LGBTQ community in the face of violence and discrimination, both past and present. It also condemns violence and discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community and recommits to securing justice, equality, and well-being for LGBTQ people in our country. Stonewall is the story of those who came before us and let their voices be heard—of those who bravely stood up and spoke out so that others would not feel compelled to live in silence or invisibly or in secrecy.

When we look back at the Stonewall uprising and the activism that grew out of that moment, even the most basic progress seemed as if it would take a revolution to achieve—so we had one. We should be proud of the enormous progress that we have made over the last 50 years. Let us remain inspired by the courage of this story, the story of Stonewall.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

S. 1790

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, Congress has no greater responsibility than providing for a strong national defense and keeping American citizens safe.

The National Defense Authorization Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation to be considered by the U.S. Senate. It authorizes the weapons systems, programs, and resources that support the men and women who serve our country in the Armed Forces. For decades, it has been approved with strong, bipartisan support.

In my home State of Colorado, our military installations, including Fort Carson, the Air Force Academy, and Buckley, Peterson, and Schriever Air Force Bases, are on the cutting edge of readiness in protecting our national security. This legislation is foundational to their mission, their work, and our show of support for the military.

I thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED for their bipartisan leadership on the Senate Armed Services Committee and on the floor. The tremendous responsibility of providing for national defense cannot be overstated, and they have handled the process with respect and the seriousness that it deserves. The security of the United States should always be more important than any partisan politics, and I appreciate their commitment that they have placed on national defense above all else.

I also thank my colleagues for their bipartisan work on the National Defense Authorization Act. In working with them, I was able to achieve a number of great victories in amendments for Colorado and the Nation as well.

Senator SCHATZ and I have a bipartisan amendment that will improve the public alert system and allow military communities access to clean and safe drinking water, which was another

amendment that we were able to work on.

I was able to work with Senator TOOMEY and Senator VAN HOLLEN—Senators from both sides of the aisle—to impose sanctions on the murderous North Korean regime.

We will also vote today to support a bipartisan effort that I authored that will encourage the U.S. Congress to stand with the people of Hong Kong and their democratic values while we urge Hong Kong's authorities to permanently withdraw their flawed extradition bill and support human rights in Hong Kong.

When one family member serves our country in uniform, the entire family serves. This legislation supports military families in Colorado and all over the world. It provides the largest pay increase in a decade for troops, and it continues to support military spouses. The NDAA addresses the challenges that servicemembers and their families face when they live in privatized housing, and it expands resources to address the PFAS water contamination in many of our military communities. This is an issue of life and health, and it matters greatly to the people of Colorado. I was pleased to work with my colleagues to continue addressing PFAS contamination.

Of course, in Colorado, we are proud to play a very key role in defending the United States. These installations that I talked about are critical to national security and supporting our operations in space. I am thrilled that this year's NDAA authorizes the U.S. Space Force so that the United States can remain a global leader in space and not fall behind China or any other foreign competitor.

Almost everything in today's age relies on space technology—telecommunications, GPS, transportation logistics, precision agriculture, and, of course, the U.S. military. Establishing the U.S. Space Force will better organize the military to handle space operations and will put all military members who work in the space domain under the same organizational umbrella. Colorado is home to the North American Aerospace Defense Command and the U.S. Northern Command, and it is the legacy home of the Air Force Space Command. As we establish the U.S. Space Force, Colorado is uniquely positioned to continue its support of our Nation's military operations in space and the mission set that space involves.

We cannot risk falling behind our foreign competitors in the second space age. In order to guarantee the safety and security of American citizens, we must maintain our leadership in space operations and defense. I urge my colleagues to support the National Defense Authorization Act, which supports defense operations across the globe and the brave women and men who serve in the U.S. military. I will always fight to protect and grow the presence of the U.S. military in Colo-

rado and work to ensure that these bases, which are essential to both national security and Colorado communities, remain strong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the yeas and nays on the substitute amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and Senator JACK REED be given such time as we shall consume prior to the vote that will take place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in just a few minutes, the Senate will vote on the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

Throughout the last week and a half, we have debated the legislation here on the Senate floor in a fair process. I thank my colleagues who have supported this bill and have helped to make a better bill through the amendment process. While I would have liked to have had more open amendments—and Senator REED and I both wanted to have more amendments on the floor—we knew that there was a problem and that we could not do that.

We are pleased that we will at least be able to clear the 93 amendments that we added on yesterday as part of the bipartisan substitute amendment in the manager's package. These include the annual Intelligence Authorization Act, the Maritime Administration Authorization and Enhancement Act, and the Fentanyl Sanctions Act.

Ultimately, the job of the NDAA is to make tough choices about where we want to invest our resources. We put our resources where they matter—in taking care of our people, in implementing the national defense strategy, and in applying recommendations from the NDS Strategy Commission Report. This is something we have used as a blueprint, and it has been very successful in taking us through this process.

Everyone agrees there are things that are going to have to happen in order to rebuild our military. That is why our top line is \$750 billion. Without that, we can't achieve the goals that we all know are necessary. It also must happen as soon as possible. We can't delay on this bill.

We still have more work to be done on the NDAA. We need to conference it. The Conference Committee can sometimes take a little bit of time. We know that is going to be done for us. We know that we want to get this thing done by our deadline, which would be October 1.

In the month of July, we have to do a lot of other things. We have to do annual appropriations bills. We have to do the budget deal. So these are some of our most important responsibilities.

We have to get them done, and here is why: Things are happening right now.

Two days ago, MSG Michael B. Riley of Heilbronn, Germany, and SGT James G. Johnston of Trumansburg, NY, lost their lives in Afghanistan while engaged in combat operations. It was tragic.

Their service and sacrifice is a reminder of why this bill is so important. We have to make sure our troops have the very best of everything, and we are in the process of getting there with this bill.

Our prayers are with Master Sergeant Riley's and Sergeant Johnston's families and loved ones. We will never forget their service or their sacrifice that they made, reminding us that freedom is not free.

There is no doubt in my mind that the NDAA we are about to pass will give our troops what they need, make American families safer, and enable to us stand up for democratic values around the world.

Let me single out and thank publicly the next speaker, the ranking member, Senator REED, for being a great partner in this. We stayed together on this. We had areas where we disagreed, but we got around those, we got things done, and the end result is a very good one.

I know Senator REED is going to want to recognize, as I do, the significance of the staff we worked with and why that is so important. Of course, we want to make sure people know—you know, Senator REED and I get a lot of credit for doing a lot of stuff that other people do. We truly appreciate these people.

Let me list some of them. First of all, John Bonsell and Liz King from my staff and from Senator REED's staff. They are the ones who really got involved in this, and we feel, without them, it would have been almost impossible—along with other people.

We had John Wason, Tom Goffus, Stephanie Barna, Diem Salmon, Greg Lilly, Marta Hernandez, Jennie Wright, Adam Barker, Augusta Binns-Berkey, Al Edwards, Jackie Kerber, Sean O'Keefe, Tony Pankuch, Brad Patout, Jason Potter, J.R. Riordan, Katie Sutton, Eric Trager, Dustin Walker, Otis Winkler, Gwyneth Woolwine, Katie Magnus, Arthur Tellis, Leah Brewer, Debbie Chiarello, Gary Howard, Tyler Wilkinson, John Bryant, Patty-Jane Geller, Baher Iskander, Keri-Lyn Michalke, Jacqueline Modestett, and Soleil Sykes.

I have a few more so just relax for a minute.

I think the others are actually from the minority side, and I am sure Senator REED is going to be recognizing them.

From my personal staff, Luke Holland, Andrew Forbes, Leacy Burke, Don Archer, Kyle Stewart, and Bryan Brody.

Lastly, from the floor staff, that is Laura Dove, Robert Duncan, Chris Tuck, Tony Hanagan, Katherine Kilroy, Brian Canfield, Abigail Baker, and Megan Mercer.

All these people worked hard. They are all a part of this team, and it certainly goes far beyond just Senator REED and myself.

I yield the floor to Senator REED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to join Chairman INHOFE in support of the fiscal year 2020 Defense authorization bill. I thank the chairman for his great bipartisan leadership, thoughtful, sensible, and delivering what I think is an excellent piece of legislation.

It was based on thorough hearings, discussions, and debate on both sides of the aisle, and it came out of the committee with strong bipartisan support. I hope it enjoys that support on final passage.

As the chairman indicated, the bill provides for many different aspects that are necessary to our national defense. It provides a pay raise for the men and women of our Armed Forces who do so much for us. It includes over 30 provisions to address the privatized military housing crisis. It authorizes military construction in almost every State in this country. It provides funding and authorities for our military personnel on the frontlines and for those who are back in the United States building the ships and the tanks and advancing the technologies we need for the future fight.

This bill also contains numerous amendments from many of my colleagues, again, on both sides of the aisle, on other issues of great importance, such as the Intelligence Authorization Act, the authorization of the Maritime Administration, and provisions addressing the fentanyl crisis and the dangers of PFOS-PFAS in our water.

There are numerous provisions here that go beyond the narrow definition of the defense establishment. They are bipartisan, and they are strongly supported by both sides of the aisle.

Again, let me thank Senator INHOFE for his leadership. It made a great difference in terms of his approach to this important legislation.

Finally, I would like to thank the committee staff. Particularly, I would like to thank the majority staff and their staff director, John Bonsell. He did a superb job—they did. “Diligence,” “professionalism,” and “bipartisanship” were the watchwords of their efforts. I thank them for that.

Let me thank my staff. In particular, Jody Bennett, Carolyn Chuhta, Jon Clark, Jonathan Epstein, Jorie Feldman, Creighton Greene, Ozge Guzelsu, Gary Leeling, Kirk McConnell, Maggie McNamara, Bill Monahan, Mike Noblet, John Quirk, Arun Seraphin, Fiona Tomlin, and my staff director, Elizabeth King, who, with John Bonsell, did a superb job.

Let me thank the floor staff who have helped us over the last few days immensely.

I urge all of my colleagues to join the chairman and me in supporting this excellent legislation.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 764

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 764, as modified and amended.

The amendment (No. 764), as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title for the third time.

The bill (S. 1790), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion is withdrawn.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. RISCH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 188 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Fischer	Portman
Baldwin	Gardner	Reed
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hassan	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rosen
Boozman	Heinrich	Rubio
Brown	Hirono	Sasse
Burr	Hoeven	Schatz
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Carper	Johnson	Shaheen
Casey	Jones	Shelby
Cassidy	Kaine	Sinema
Collins	Kennedy	Smith
Coons	King	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Moran	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murray	Wicker
Ernst	Perdue	Young
Feinstein	Peters	

NAYS—8

Booker	Lee	Paul
Braun	Markey	Wyden
Klobuchar	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—6

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Gillibrand	Rounds	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 86, the nays are 8.

The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill, as amended, is passed.

The bill (S. 1790), as amended, was passed.

(The bill, as modified, as amended, will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the escalating tensions between the United States and Iran, my concern about the administration's current approach—a path that I am worried will lead us to war—and my support for the Udall amendment to the NDAA, which will be voted on tomorrow.

I believe that diplomatic efforts, in concert with our international partners, should be pursued immediately to avoid another unnecessary armed conflict in the Middle East.

Let me be clear. Iran is a dangerous and destabilizing force in the region. It supports terrorist proxies and meddles in the internal affairs of other states. Iran continues to pursue ballistic missile capabilities in violation of international norms and abuses the rights of its own people. Unfortunately, the administration's chosen course of action with respect to Iran has isolated the United States from the international community and made it more difficult to collectively address these issues.

The administration's actions and rhetoric related to Iran have created a credibility deficit. This is a fast-changing and dangerous situation, and it is clear that there is not a consensus within the international community with respect to Iran's plans and intentions.

Given these disconnects, it is imperative for the administration to provide Congress with current, unvarnished intelligence so that we may reach substantiated conclusions.

Taking a step back, it is important to recount the actions that have precipitated the current state of affairs. Current tensions are an entirely predictable outcome of the administration's ill-conceived approach to Iran.

Despite then-Candidate Trump's campaign rhetoric, I and others hoped that he would heed the advice of the advisers with respect to the Iran nuclear agreement, also known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or the JCPOA.

For example, despite personal concerns about the JCPOA before it was signed, former Secretary of Defense Mattis told the Armed Services Committee at his confirmation hearing that "when America gives her word, we have to live up to it and work with our allies."

In October 2017, Secretary Mattis told the Armed Services Committee that he believed it was in our national interest to remain in the JCPOA. General Dunford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, echoed these sentiments at the time and cautioned that, in his words, "the U.S. will incur damage vis-a-vis our allies if we unilaterally withdraw from the JCPOA. Our allies will be less likely to cooperate with us on future military action to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon and less likely to cooperate with us on countering other destabilizing aspects of Iranian behavior that threaten our collective interests."

The administration should have sought to work with the international community to address the challenges posed by Iran by building upon the foundation of the JCPOA rather than squandering that opportunity in favor of "putting Iran on notice" and other inflammatory rhetoric.

Just over a year ago, President Trump made the disastrous decision to unilaterally withdraw the United States from the JCPOA and reimpose nuclear-related sanctions, in violation of previous U.S. commitments under the deal. Since withdrawing from the deal, the Trump administration has taken a series of additional escalatory actions, including the imposition of new sanctions on various aspects of the Iranian economy; cancellation of waivers that previously allowed importation of Iranian oil by China, India, Japan, South Korea, and Turkey; and the designation of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps—often referred to as the IRGC—as a foreign terrorist organization.

The designation of a foreign government entity as a foreign terrorist organization was unprecedented, and it is not clear what purpose it served other than to unnecessarily raise tensions with Iran. As I learned during a recent visit to Iraq and Afghanistan, the IRGC designation has significantly complicated our relationships with foreign partners who described the action as provocative and destabilizing.

While the JCPOA was not a perfect deal, it was a necessary deal. It is important to remember that when the JCPOA was signed, Iran's "breakout" timeline—the amount of time Iran would need to produce enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon—was only 2 to 3 months. Even by the most

conservative estimates, the JCPOA stretched that timeline to more than a year.

By all accounts, the JCPOA has worked as intended. The JCPOA commits Iran to never seeking to develop or acquire a nuclear weapon and effectively cuts off all pathways for Iran to achieve a nuclear weapon until at least 2030. The agreement dramatically reduced Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium and the number of installed centrifuges. It also prevented Iran from producing weapons-grade plutonium and has subjected Iran to the most intrusive monitoring regime in the world to ensure it is living up to its commitments.

The JCPOA was appropriately built upon the concept of "distrust and verify," and I support efforts by our European partners, as well as Russia and China, to preserve the JCPOA despite challenges the Trump administration has put in their way.

According to General Dunford, in the absence of the JCPOA, Iran would likely resume its nuclear weapons program, and, in his words, "a nuclear-armed Iran would likely be more aggressive in its actions and more dangerous in its consequences."

Unfortunately, the administration's withdrawal from the agreement and reimposition of sanctions has left us isolated from our allies and partners while emboldening the hardliners in Iran.

In May of last year, subsequent to the decision to withdraw from the JCPOA, Secretary of State Pompeo articulated a set of 12 "demands" and indicated that "major changes" would need to be made by Iran before sanctions relief would be provided. The administration has sent mixed messages on whether its demands should be viewed as a set of preconditions for discussions on sanctions relief. The demands outlined by Secretary Pompeo are widely viewed as maximalist and leave little room for negotiation, especially given that the administration has already reneged on previous diplomatic commitments related to Iran's nuclear program.

Without greater certainty by the administration on what specific actions would need to be taken by Iran to relieve U.S. economic pressure, I fear that Iran has little incentive to engage in negotiations.

Indeed, the administration has followed that initial set of 12 demands with a succession of orchestrated steps to force Iran into an ever-smaller corner that only serves to increase the odds of miscalculation and reduce diplomatic opportunities. The economic sanctions by the United States have left the Iranian economy reeling, with its gross domestic product shrinking by 5 percent and the inflation rate rising by 50 percent.

As part of this so-called "Maximum Pressure" campaign, the administration has just announced personal sanctions against Supreme Leader Ali

Khamenei and other Iranian leadership. The Iranians have responded by indicating that these sanctions mean "the permanent closure of the doors of diplomacy."

Rather than modifying its behavior, Iran has responded to these demands and subsequent escalatory actions by increasing its malign activities in the region, including in Yemen and Syria, and announcing that it would stop complying with certain aspects of the JCPOA. If Iran follows through on threats to completely withdraw from the JCPOA and resume nuclear weapons development activities, the United States and the international community will be in a much less unified and therefore weaker negotiating position than we had leading up to the JCPOA.

As I assess the current state of affairs, I see four potential outcomes of the current approach being pursued by the administration.

First, Iran could bend to the will of the administration and announce its compliance with the so-called 12 demands laid out by Secretary Pompeo. However, Iran has a long history of struggle against outside forces. A notable example is the Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s. Additionally, Iranian capitulation would likely threaten its top priority of regime survival, so clearly this is an unrealistic outcome.

Second, Iran could remain in the JCPOA despite seeing little of the economic benefits promised by the deal and hope that a future U.S. administration would return to the agreement. Iran's recent announcement that it would stop complying with aspects of the JCPOA is a signal that it views the current arrangement as unsustainable and is willing to abandon the JCPOA completely if its economic situation does not improve in the near term.

Third, Iran could agree to return to the negotiating table, seeking a reduction in tensions and easing of sanctions. However, both the administration and Iranian leaders have made clear that they are not interested in such an approach.

In announcing the administration's strategy for Iran last May, Secretary Pompeo stated that President Trump is "ready, willing, and able to negotiate a new deal" but also made clear that "we will not renegotiate the JCPOA itself."

On May 8, Iranian President Rouhani stated:

We are ready to negotiate, within the boundaries of JCPOA. . . . It is not us who left the negotiation table.

These seem to be irreconcilable positions, especially after the latest round of sanctions directed at the Iranian leadership.

Lastly and most significant, I believe, the current approach could result in a military conflict between the United States and Iran. The destruction of an American unmanned drone flying in international airspace by a missile fired from Iran is an example of the potential for widespread conflict. Only at the last minute did President

Trump call off a strike against the Iranian missile sites in retaliation. He concluded correctly that such a strike would be disproportionate. But the incident underscores the precarious position we are in after months of the misguided “maximum pressure” campaign.

Iranian action, either directed by national leadership or mistakenly taken by zealous supporters, could put us on an escalatory ladder of strike and counterstrike that would involve the entire region from Afghanistan to the Levant.

In addition and equally troubling is that an unarticulated goal of this so-called “Maximum Pressure” campaign is to prompt Iran to leave the JCPOA either officially or by gradually increasing its stock of highly enriched uranium or other aspects of its nuclear program. This could give advocates for a military strike on Iran increased leverage. Again, such a strike, even targeted to nuclear facilities, would likely prompt a regional asymmetric response by Iran, with significant military as well as economic consequences.

Like all of my colleagues, I am deeply concerned about Iranian threats to U.S. personnel facilities in the Middle East. U.S. forces have the unquestioned and inherent right to defend themselves, but absent an Iranian directed or sponsored attack or the imminent threat of such an attack on U.S. personnel facilities or key strategic interests, military actions should be pursued only as a last resort and as part of an international coalition, which the administration has so far failed to bring together.

I will be supporting the amendment offered by Senator UDALL because it would make clear that any offensive military action against Iran must be consistent with domestic and international law, including a specific authorization for the use of military force, or an AUMF, provided by Congress.

In this context, the President’s demonstrated willingness not just to bend the facts but to indulge, in certain cases, in fabrications is particularly concerning and unacceptable when it may come to deploying our troops into harm’s way. Congress has the responsibility to demand and, if necessary, challenge the basis for unsupported assertions of Iranian aggression and provocation that could be used to take this country to war.

Echoing one of the themes used in the Bush administration’s justification for the 2003 Iraq war, Secretary of State Pompeo testified to the Senate in April that “there’s no doubt there is a connection between the Islamic Republic of Iran and al Qaeda. Period. Full stop.” And he refused to rule out the use of the 2001 AUMF as a means to conduct military action against Iran.

While Iran is a state sponsor of terror, I am not aware of compelling evidence to suggest Iran or Iranian affiliated groups are an “associated force” of al-Qaida for the purposes of the 2001 AUMF.

In fact, such an arrangement is hard to fathom, given the deep religious and ideological differences between the Shia leadership of Iran and the Sunni leadership of al-Qaida. The administration must come to Congress if it seeks to pursue offensive military action.

Likewise, any consideration of military action against Iran must fully account for the likely cost of such an engagement—in lives, resources, potential negative impact on the global economy, disruption of U.S. bilateral relationships, and other unintended consequences. The administration must provide the American people with a clear-eyed assessment of what those costs may be in advance of any contemplated military engagement.

The Trump administration’s escalatory attacks may soon place Iran in an untenable position. As a result, Iran may seek to change the status quo by initiating a limited military conflict with the United States, thereby requiring the intervention of the international community. If such a scenario comes to pass, our recent efforts to deter Iran through the deployment of additional military capabilities to the region will have failed, and even a limited conflict would be very difficult to manage or to bring to a conclusion.

The President and others in the administration have consistently downplayed the potential costs of conflict with Iran. In fact, just yesterday, the President said that “if something should happen [with Iran], we’re in a very strong position. It wouldn’t last very long.” The President’s assessment is undercut by his own Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, who told Congress earlier this year:

Iran continues to develop and approve a range of new military capabilities to target U.S. and allied military assets in the region, including armed UAVs, ballistic missiles, advanced naval mines, unmanned explosive boats, submarines and advanced torpedoes, and antiship and land-attack cruise missiles. Iran has the largest ballistic missile force in the Middle East and can strike targets up to 2,000 kilometers from Iran’s borders. Russia’s delivery of the SA-20c SAM system in 2016 has provided Iran with its most advanced long-range air defense system.

In addition to the conventional military capabilities laid out by Director Coats, Iran maintains a network of proxy forces throughout the region, many of whom operate in close proximity to U.S. military personnel in Iraq and Syria. They maintain the capability to conduct lethal action against our forces and facilities without notice.

Recently retired commander of the U.S. Central Command, General Votel, told the Armed Services Committee in February:

The Iranian regime masks its malign activities through proxies and surrogates enabled by the Iran Threat Network in Yemen, Syria, Iraq, and Lebanon. Iran is also attempting to build ground lines of communication through Iraq and Syria into Lebanon to support its proxy Hezbollah. Iran has gained influence with Iraq’s armed forces with the formalization of Popular Mobiliza-

tion Forces, and also exerted influence in Lebanon, Iraq, and Yemen, oftentimes affecting established sovereign governments.

The combination of Iran’s known conventional and asymmetric capabilities should dispel any notion that conflict with Iran would be quick or could be won only through the use of U.S. air power. As former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates reportedly said in a recent speech: “If you think the war in Iraq was hard, an attack on Iran would, in my opinion, be a catastrophe.”

He continued: “[Iranian] capacity to wage a series of terror attacks across the Middle East aimed at us and our friends, and dramatically worsen the situation in Iraq, Afghanistan, Lebanon, and elsewhere is hard to overestimate.”

All of the competent military analysts I have engaged with believe that we cannot conduct an effective land campaign in Iran, and an extended air and sea campaign will undercut the priorities laid out in the national defense strategy, which focuses not on the Middle East but on Russia and China.

Absent the full mobilization of our Armed Forces and those of our allies, ground operations in Iran are simply beyond our capacity. The last ground war involving Iran, the Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s, resulted in the death of nearly 1 million troops, the majority of whom were Iranians who died fighting a superior Iraqi military during a brutal and prolonged conflict. There is clearly no widespread U.S. or international support for another such military engagement in the Middle East.

Considering the costs associated with ground operations, a more limited conflict involving a series of tit-for-tat actions is far more likely, with Iran utilizing its asymmetric advantages and proxies in response to U.S. precision and standoff strikes.

It is unlikely that U.S. deterrence could be quickly reestablished under such a scenario, and Iran may use the time to restart and advance its nuclear weapons efforts, thereby increasing its negotiating leverage and also making the situation much more volatile.

War with Iran is not inevitable. To date, the administration has tried to use every instrument of national power to get Iran to change its behavior—except diplomacy and negotiations. The administration’s ill-conceived approach has not worked, and the time has come to try real and sustained diplomacy, rather than relying on coercion.

I urge the President and those in the administration to take this moment of high tension to engage with our allies and partners with the goal of seeking a diplomatic solution to the current situation. In that context and in that spirit, I will support the Udall amendment tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

## BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the 116th Congress, so far, has just talked about the humanitarian crisis at the border. Most of our Democratic colleagues have claimed up to this point that there is no crisis or emergency at the border.

We will recall that we started out the year with a government shutdown because of the battle over border security, and our Democratic friends made one thing perfectly clear: They would oppose any effort to fund our security mission at the border. That resulted in the 35-day shutdown.

The Speaker of the House at the time called the situation “a fake crisis at the border,” and the minority leader here in the Senate referred it to as “a crisis that does not exist.” Well, they weren’t the only ones. Throughout the Halls of the Capitol, Democrats in Congress used terms like “phony,” “imaginary,” and “make-believe” to describe the challenges our frontline officers and agents were facing every day.

While our Democratic colleagues have reflexively denied the existence of a crisis at the border, the problems have grown only bigger each day. Of course, it was 2014, I will remind my friends across the aisle, when Barack Obama, then President of the United States, declared a humanitarian and security crisis at the border. So it seemed very odd to me that, in 2019, they decided—when the numbers kept getting bigger and bigger and conditions worse and worse—all of a sudden that the humanitarian and security crisis had gone away.

The fact is, over the last 3 months, the number of illegal crossings across the southwestern border have hit six figures, something we haven’t seen since 2006. We surpassed the number of unaccompanied children apprehended at the height of the 2014 crisis that President Obama was speaking about.

This mass migration has nearly depleted our Federal resources, causing the President to request \$4½ billion for humanitarian assistance and border operations. That request came almost 2 months ago—almost 2 months ago, and Congress has not acted.

Now, it seems, our Democratic colleagues have finally accepted the facts. There is a very real and very urgent humanitarian crisis on our southern border. The bill they passed earlier this week meets the dollar amount requested by the President, but the substance of the bill shows that House Democrats don’t want to send funding where it is actually needed the most.

Unlike the Senate’s bipartisan bill, the original House bill excluded funding for the Department of Defense, immigration judge teams, and underfunded both Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Customs and Border Protection. This morning, they made a last-ditch effort to inject some of their deeply partisan provisions back into our Senate bipartisan bill. While the House Democrats did increase needed

funding in some areas, the newly amended version still includes divisive provisions and reduces funding in areas that the Senate overwhelmingly rejected yesterday.

Here is just one example. Democrats in the House cut the Senate bill’s appropriation of \$21 million for ICE Homeland Security investigations to conduct—get this—human trafficking investigations. So the House wanted to cut \$21 million in the Senate appropriations bill that was dedicated to investigating human trafficking. This is just the latest example of their fundamental lack of interest in sending money where it is needed most—only where it is politically convenient.

It is unfortunately not much of a surprise. Our Democratic friends are trying to keep up with their candidates running for President, whose positions on immigration and border security get more extreme each day. Now, more than one Democrat running for the nomination for President actually supports making entering the country illegally legal—in other words, no orderly immigration system at all—a free-for-all, where it is easier for human traffickers and drug smugglers to come and go as they please. And, of course, there is this: no consideration given for those would-be immigrants who are trying to wait patiently in line and do things exactly the right way and no consideration of the unfairness of those who would jump ahead of the line and enter the country illegally before those who are trying to do it the right way.

The House bill stands in stark contrast to the bipartisan agreement we passed here in the Senate, which funds a range of programs at the Federal departments and agencies working to manage the crisis, and, importantly, it is the only bill in town that has the support of the President. It is, after all, important to get the President’s signature on legislation for it to become law.

The Senate Appropriations Committee overwhelmingly supported this bill, and it passed the committee by a vote of 30 to 1. When the full Senate voted on it yesterday, only eight Members of the Senate voted no.

We have simply waited long enough. We waited too long, in my view, for Democrats to acknowledge this real humanitarian crisis. The House bill is inadequate and mostly a partisan effort.

Our Democratic colleagues have resisted acting for far too long already, making this humanitarian crisis worse. They circulate the very tragic pictures of a father with his young child face down in the waters of the Rio Grande River, and they somehow fail to acknowledge their own complicity in failing to act to provide the sorts of fixes to our asylum laws that would deter, if not prevent, that sort of thing from occurring in the first place. They really do need to look in the mirror.

We need to take action now, and I hope we don’t have to wait any longer

for our colleagues in the House to pass the Senate’s bipartisan bill.

S. 1790

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on another note, I listened with great interest as the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Rhode Island, spoke about Iran and the challenges we face there. I agree with some and maybe even most of what he had to say.

The American people were appalled when, last week, Iran took down an unmanned American aircraft over international waters. As the Senator said, ordinarily, Iran operates by proxies or by third parties, whether it is the Shia militia in Iraq or Hezbollah or one of their other terrorist proxies like those operating in Yemen, the Houthis. But Iran escalated its attack against the United States by shooting an unmanned drone flying over international waters, so it was quite a shocking move from that standpoint, even from a nation as untethered as Iran.

Iran has been engaged in a 30-year conflict with the United States, one that has resulted in the death of U.S. servicemembers in Iraq and elsewhere—victims of explosively formed penetrators and other training that the IRGC, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, their Quds Force, their Special Operations force—the training they gave to terrorists operating in Iraq to kill Americans.

Then there is the periodic harassment of American and other international vessels operating in the Strait of Hormuz, a narrow strait through which a huge portion of the world’s energy supplies flow. So this is, in some ways, an escalation of what has been a 30-year conflict between Iran and the United States.

Tehran has waged acts of aggression against the United States and our allies. It has exported terrorism around the globe. It is the No. 1 state sponsor of international terrorism, and it has engaged in gross human rights violations against its own people.

As I indicated, Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, or IRGC, is the loyal henchman responsible for leading these acts. It is a branch of Iran’s Armed Forces which tries to squash democracy movements at home and abroad by pushing its extreme ideology beyond Iran’s borders.

The Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps wields vast power and influence and uses its capabilities to encourage turmoil and conflict and violence throughout the Middle East. It funds arms, training, and foot soldiers to the terrorist groups that spread their radical ideology.

While the terrorist activities alone are enough to cause concern, the IRGC is also in control of Iran’s ballistic missile program, which unfortunately has only accelerated under the previous administration’s deeply flawed nuclear deal, known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the JCPOA. Once

we saw the details of that deal in 2015, it quickly became clear that it was not much of a deal at all. If the goal is to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon—well, it obviously failed in that goal.

As the majority leader said at the time, it “appears to fall well short of the goal we all thought was trying to be achieved, which was that Iran would not be a nuclear state.”

Despite the restrictions it would impose, the deal would leave Iran with a vast nuclear program and allow it to continue to conduct research and development on advanced centrifuges and building intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Perhaps worse, the nuclear deal would lift those restrictions in a decade. In other words, it was 2015 when the JCPOA was signed by the relevant parties. So by postponing Iran’s ability to develop a nuclear weapon, we are already half of the way there almost. It is no wonder that then-Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu delivered an address to Congress in March of 2015 and said the JCPOA “doesn’t block Iran’s path to the bomb; it paves Iran’s path to the bomb.” That certainly seems to be the case. We have seen Iran violate the nuclear deal and U.N. resolutions time after time, and it is clear that their resolve to create nuclear weapons remains their highest priority.

Just a year ago, President Trump announced the United States would pull out of the nuclear deal, a decision I strongly supported. Even at the time Secretary Kerry, the Secretary of State, admitted that the tens of billions of dollars the United States released to go to Iran would be used to fund their terrorist activities, he supported it nonetheless. He supported it even though it paved the way for Iran to get a nuclear weapon 10 years after the JCPOA was signed.

Since the Trump administration has withdrawn from the JCPOA, it has taken resolute action against Iran, including stronger sanctions on entities and individuals and the designation of the IRGC as a foreign terrorist organization, which it clearly is. Somehow, though, despite the unprovoked attacks, flagrant violations of international agreements, and human rights violations, some of our friends on the left and the mainstream media have grossly mischaracterized the situation and have somehow managed to point the finger at the Trump administration for starting the fight in the first place. They want to blame America, and they want to blame this administration.

Let me be clear. Iran is the aggressor. Their history as the chief mischief-maker in the Middle East began long before President Trump took office, so don’t lay this at his feet. From the Iran hostage crisis to their outright support of terrorist groups in the Middle East, to this latest strike at a U.S. aircraft, something they admitted—they said: We did it—their actions at

every turn have demonstrated a desire not only to escalate the conflict with the United States and our interests and allies but to spread their violent extremism without regard for anyone else.

I have to say it has been 74 years since a nuclear weapon was exploded during World War II, and I hope and pray there is never again a nuclear weapon exploded on our planet, but can you imagine Iran, the No. 1 state sponsor of international terrorism, getting a nuclear weapon? We can never ever allow that to happen.

This last week marked the 23rd anniversary of a notable episode in Iran’s sad history of terrorism. That was the 23rd anniversary of the Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia. In 1996, a truck bomb was detonated adjacent to a building housing members of the U.S. Air Force’s 4404th Wing, killing 19 U.S. Air Force personnel and a Saudi local and wounding 498 others.

If Tehran expects to continue exporting terrorism and violence around the world without a response from the United States and our allies, they are sorely mistaken.

If Iran can continue to escalate with no response from the United States or our allies, they are going to continue to escalate as much as they can, which I think is more dangerous than a proportional U.S. response to what happened in the Strait of Hormuz.

The President has opted for hard-hitting sanctions, which I think are a good start. Those sanctions announced by the administration earlier this week represent an appropriate response to the Iranian escalation consistent with President Trump’s maximum pressure strategy on Iran. These sanctions will deny the Supreme Leader, the Supreme Leader’s office, and close affiliates access to resources they need to finance their rogue regime. There is no benefit—in the interest of peace—to applying anything less than maximum pressure on Iran to change their behavior. The tentacles of the IRGC run deep into their economy, and these sanctions will prevent them from amassing even greater power to develop sophisticated weapons.

We have seen reports that the economic challenges they are encountering as a result of the sanctions already in place are making it harder for them to finance their terrorist operations through their proxy.

The actions taken by Iran show that they are feeling the squeeze of these sanctions, and they know exactly what they need to do before they can get relief. As Secretary of State Pompeo said, “When the Iranian regime decides to forgo violence and meet our diplomacy with diplomacy, it knows how to reach us.”

I sincerely hope to see the day when the Iranian people can live without fear, when their government respects its own citizens and international allies and lives by international norms and finally decides to forgo its nuclear weapons. Until that day comes, I hope

our allies will stand with us in confronting the tyrants in Iran and doing everything in our power to push back against the world’s largest state sponsor of terror.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

S. 1790

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, tomorrow this body faces an opportunity, in fact, an obligation to reassert its proper constitutional role in warmaking.

I urge my colleagues to support the Udall-Kaine amendment, a provision to prohibit funding for unauthorized and unapproved military operations against Iran. No vote will be more important during this session than the one we cast tomorrow. It is not only the imminence of potential conflict, it is the reality that we would be surrendering our proper constitutional responsibility and our right if we fail to adopt this amendment. The American people already believe we have ceded too much authority to the executive branch; that we are implicitly, if not directly and explicitly, approving an imperial presence. This amendment puts us to the test before the American people.

The Congress has a job to do. We should do that job tomorrow. We should insist that we have the authority and we have the obligation to consider whether there are military operations against Iran.

We can talk about policy. There is no question that Iran is a malign and treacherously bad actor in that part of the world. There is no doubt that it poses a clear and present jeopardy to the world community. Iran may well have installed mines on the two tankers that were severely damaged recently and may well be the culprit in shooting down an American drone in the past week, but the United States is on a perilous course. We are on a dangerous course toward continued escalation and possible miscalculation that may create a spiral of uncontrollable military responses.

It isn’t that we have a dangerous policy, it is that we have no policy, no strategy, no endgame articulated by the President of the United States or anyone in this administration. To resort to military action rather than reliance on diplomatic approaches is a recipe for potential disaster.

This unintended escalation could result from more miscalculation or it could result from purposeful desire on one side or both sides among a small number of advisers or military leaders that there be a resort to kinetic activity, but we have, in the meantime, an opportunity to resort to diplomacy, to enlist our allies and partners. This situation is the result of our putting those allies, in part, in an extraordinarily difficult position.

The current tensions with Iran today are the direct result of President

Trump's ill-conceived policy toward Iran ever since he carelessly and recklessly discarded the Iran nuclear deal last year. His approach to foreign policy has been indecisive and chaotic, and that is partly the reason why tensions have escalated with an adversary rather than preserving key nuclear agreements and engaging in diplomacy.

We must now deescalate and resort to diplomacy. Even if one disagrees with that point, puts aside the President's bellicose and bullying rhetoric, and even if there is the thought that Iran is solely and completely responsible for this situation, the United States should not engage in military operations without the authorization of Congress. Yes, it may defend against or deter an immediate attack that is so urgent that defense of the country has to be undertaken by the Commander in Chief. But this Senate should prevent the President from entering and starting and engaging in another war in the Middle East under the misguided idea that there is a 2001 authorization that allows him to do so legally.

Let me be perfectly clear. A failure of the prohibition funding amendment we will consider tomorrow is not itself an authorization for the President to wage war with Iran. The Constitution trumps any statute. The Constitution requires action by Congress. Without congressional authorization and anything short of specific authority for declaration of war from Congress, starting or waging a war with Iran would be unconstitutional.

But the NDAA on the floor this week is an opportune time—in fact, a perfect opportunity—for Congress to reassert its constitutional authority over the role of the declaration of war. We must seize this moment. We can't simply allow or rely on the outdated 2001 authorization for the use of military force. We cannot allow its intent to be so distorted and stretched and our constitutionally required oversight to be disregarded. We have an obligation to conduct oversight continually and push back on an administration that makes false claims to advance its war-mongering agenda.

The NDAA we passed today gives us the authority to undertake our defense of the Nation.

S. 1790

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Let me begin by thanking Ranking Member JACK REED of Rhode Island and Chairman INHOFE of Oklahoma, as well as my other colleagues on the committee and my staff, who have worked tirelessly on this to include key elements of my proposal that are important to our military, as well as to our Nation.

This NDAA includes comprehensive reforms to the Military Housing Privatization Initiative. It changes military housing in ways that are long overdue and will prioritize families, ensure long-term quality assurance, and enhance accountability.

In the hearings held by the Armed Services Committee with military families who have experienced adverse health effects and financial burden from residing in hazardous housing, one point was absolutely clear: Our Nation is failing military families who live in this military housing. The conditions, widespread and prevalent, are entirely unacceptable. I was heartbroken to hear much of this testimony from military families who already sacrifice so much and who have struggled to secure safe and livable conditions.

I visited some of the homes at the New London base, and I was struck by the mold, the repairs that were needed, the defects in appliances, and the complaints about lack of proper air-conditioning and heating. We owe our military families much better, and we owe law enforcement the support they need to crack down on fraudulent private contractors.

I am also proud that the NDAA includes my provision to prohibit the Trump administration from modifying military installations to detain migrant children who have been forcibly separated from their parents. The separation policies of this administration have been absolutely abhorrent and antithetical to our values and ideals. They have been shameful and disgraceful.

We have seen the photos, and those pictures are worth a thousand of my words today, but the misuse of military resources, as I have repeatedly emphasized, to implement this administration's radical immigration enforcement agenda—this provision is a small but necessary step toward protecting migrant families from the cruelties of this family separation policy. It is only the beginning. We need to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security reimburses the Defense Department when military resources are used for support at the border. This kind of measure will hopefully prevent DHS from using the Pentagon as a piggy bank—a financial resource for cruel and inhumane policies.

We need to ensure that the President is stopped from abusing his Executive authority by deploying troops to assist in deportation.

We also considered floor amendments to the NDAA. I want to highlight an amendment that I offered to improve equity in the post-9/11 GI bill benefit. Last July, the Pentagon issued a new policy on servicemembers' ability to transfer unused education benefits to their family members. These new policies prevent servicemembers with more than 16 years of military service from transferring education benefits at the time that military servicemembers opt to transfer rather than when they become eligible. The Pentagon argues that these changes were made to ensure that the Department keeps a key retention tool—all while breaking our promise to military families by moving the goalpost of transfer eligibility and

exacerbating inequities in transferring educational benefits. Most notably, disqualifying servicemembers with more than 16 years of military services counterintuitively penalizes the men and women who have served this country in uniform for the longest time.

My amendment would make the post-9/11 GI bill an earned benefit rather than a retention tool and ensure that all servicemembers who have completed 10 years of service in the armed services and Armed Forces are eligible to transfer their benefits to dependents at any time, both while serving on Active Duty and as a veteran.

Despite the passage of the NDAA and the need for this amendment continuing, I will continue to champion equitable education benefits for our military families.

This year's NDAA makes important, unprecedented investments in the submarines, helicopters, and aircraft built in Connecticut. They are not only manufactured in my State—employing thousands of skilled workers vital to our defense industrial base—but they are also critical to our national security. They keep our country safe, and they make sure our Nation and our military have a fair fight. They play a vital role in our defense industry thanks to the unparalleled skills and unstinting dedication of our manufacturing workforce. Because of that workforce, we are able to build the best submarines and the best F-35 engines and other aircraft engines and helicopters in the world—not only through that skilled workforce and those major contractors but the workers at suppliers and contractors, who are equally vital.

Last year, we built two submarines. This year, there will be two more, with procurement for another major part of a submarine. As we begin accelerating production of those Virginia-class submarines, the New London Sub Base must have the capacity to support increased submarine output. That is why I fought for \$72.3 million to replace Pier 32 at Sub Base New London, ensuring a modern landing to accommodate multiple Virginia-class submarines.

I was proud to lead the fight for increased investment in those Virginia-class submarines. That included \$4.7 billion for those two submarines and nearly \$4.3 billion in that advance procurement for a third Virginia-class submarine.

The NDAA also includes \$2.3 billion—which is \$140 million above the President's request—for the Columbia-class program.

I was proud, as well, to champion over \$10 billion for 94 F-35s, which are important to all of our military services. That is an additional 16 above the President's request.

In helicopter production, we will keep faith with the warfighters and with our defense industrial base at Sikorsky.

Today's effort is a tribute to the leadership and the bipartisan efforts in



this Congress. I thank and applaud my colleagues for coming together on behalf of our Nation's defense, which is especially important in a time of disillusionment and seeming dysfunction for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

#### REMEMBERING WILLIAM MODEN

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor an officer of the Colorado State Patrol whose watch tragically came to an end earlier this month when he was killed in the line of duty.

On June 14, 2019, Trooper William Moden was responding to an accident that occurred on I-70 in Deer Trail, CO. He was doing what he did every day—responding to an incident and giving a helping hand to Coloradans in need. He was assisting the passengers of a vehicle who were involved in a crash—one of whom was an 18-month-old child—when he was struck by a passing vehicle.

Like too many of our Nation's law enforcement officers, Trooper Moden gave his life while protecting and serving others.

William Moden was 37 years old and had served in the Colorado State Patrol for 12 years. His fellow troopers remember him as someone whose uniform was always perfect and whose boots were always polished. There is no doubt for any of them that he was meant to serve and that he did so with the utmost honor and dignity.

While Trooper Moden carried out his duties with seriousness, his friends and loved ones remember him as someone with a tremendous sense of humor. At a memorial service held last week, he was described as having an infectious laugh—a laugh that was usually the loudest in the room. Many at the service remembered the time he put on a dog's shock collar just to see how it felt and to make others laugh. These are the kinds of memories his loved ones will remember forever.

Just as he answered when his Coloradans called, his friends and family say he was someone who could always be counted on. He was reliable, dependable, and they often described him as their "knight in shining armor"—someone who is always there to provide care and comfort. The chief of the Colorado State Patrol, Colonel Matt Packard, described William Moden as "the true personification of what it means to be a Colorado State Trooper."

At the memorial service last week, Trooper Moden was awarded the title of "Master Trooper"—a rank given only to those who show great leadership and character. To those who knew him, William completely exemplified these characteristics and is certainly deserving of this high honor.

We know we can never pay the debt of gratitude owed to people like William Moden, who risk their lives every

day to ensure their communities are safe. The best we can offer is to never forget and to continue to celebrate the lives of those who sacrifice everything.

I know my Senate colleagues will join me in mourning the loss of Trooper Moden and all those who have given their lives in defending the thin blue line.

So for the second time this year, I come to the floor of the U.S. Senate and remember the words of LTC Dave Grossman, who said, "American law enforcement is the loyal and brave sheep dog always standing watch for the wolf that lurks in the dark."

I hope the outpouring of love and support that Trooper Moden's family and friends have received in the past few weeks bring them a small bit of comfort.

To Trooper Moden's family and loved ones, our State thanks you for your service, sacrifice, and willingness to share William with the people of Colorado.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

#### BORDER SECURITY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor once again to speak about a humanitarian crisis that is not taking place in Yemen or in Syria or in any foreign country but, rather, right here at the southern border of the United States.

They say a picture speaks a thousand words, but I think it is even more than that. Photographs have the power to cut through noise, speak the truth, and invoke action.

We all remember the heartbreaking image of a little boy who was covered in ash while he sat in an ambulance in Syria. It told us all we needed to know about acts of mass murder committed by Bashar al-Assad. Likewise, we remember the look in the eyes of the malnourished girl who was on the brink of death in Yemen—one of more than 85,000 children to have succumbed to hunger during Saudi Arabia's disastrous bombing campaign. Yet the photo I have brought to the floor today has shaken me to the core as a father, as a grandfather, as a son of immigrants, and above all else, as an American.

Like the other photographs I mentioned, this one tells a story too. This one speaks an ugly truth, and that truth is that President Trump's cruel, inhumane, and un-American border policies have failed. They have failed to make us safer. They have failed to reduce migration to our border. They have also failed to live up to the American values that define our leadership around the world.

We will never forget this heartbreaking photo. More importantly, we will not forget the names of Oscar Alberto Martinez and his 23-month-old daughter, Valeria. They drowned in a

desperate attempt to claim asylum in the United States.

Oscar, Valeria, and Tania, her mother, fled El Salvador in the hopes of seeking asylum in the United States.

The Washington Post reported:

They traveled more than 1,000 miles seeking it. . . . But the farthest the family got was an international bridge in Matamoros, Mexico. On Sunday, they were told the bridge was closed and that they should return Monday. Aid workers told The Post the line to get across the bridge was hundreds long.

The young family was desperate. Standing on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande, America looked within reach. Martinez and Valeria waded in. But before they all made it to the other side, the river waters pulled the 25-year-old and his daughter under and swept them away.

Later, when Mexican authorities recovered their bodies, Oscar and Valeria were still clinging to each other.

Here in the United States, it is hard to imagine what kind of desperate conditions would propel you to flee your home and embark on a perilous journey in search of protection from a foreign nation.

Most of these families who arrive at our border come from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras—three countries that are collectively known as the Northern Triangle. It is a region that is plagued by transnational gang violence, weak institutions, and poverty. Young boys are forced into servitude by gangs. Young girls are beaten and raped if they refuse to become their girlfriends. Parents who try to protect their children end up getting killed. These countries are among the most dangerous in the world. In El Salvador, a woman is murdered every 19 hours, and in Honduras—the country with the highest homicide rate in the world for women—a woman is killed every 16 hours.

To be blunt, these families face an impossible choice. It is either stay and die or flee for a chance to live.

Well, if this horrific and tragic photograph does anything, I hope it dispels us of the ludicrous notion that you can deter desperate families from fleeing their homes in search of safety. That is how the Trump administration describes its cruel policies at the border—deterrence.

In the name of deterrence, it is tearing children and babies away from their mothers and fathers. In the name of deterrence, it is shutting down legitimate ports of entry, effectively encouraging migrant families to seek more dangerous methods of getting into the United States, like crossing the Rio Grande. In the name of deterrence, children are being housed in unsanitary conditions, which leaves infants in dirty diapers and children without soap or toothpaste.

Let me share with our colleagues just a few of the statements that the children who have been kept in these abhorrent conditions have made.

Said one 8-year-old boy:

They took us away from our grandmother, and now we are all alone. They have not

given us to our mother. We have been here for a long time. I have to take care of my little sister. She is very sad because she misses our mother and grandmother very much. . . . We sleep on a cement bench. There are two mats in the room, but the big kids sleep on the mats, so we have to sleep on the cement bench.

Consider the words of a 16-year-old girl:

We slept on mats on the floor, and they gave us aluminum blankets. They took our baby's diapers, baby formula, and all of our belongings. Our clothes were still wet, and we were very cold, so we got sick. . . . I have been in the U.S. for 6 days, and I have never been offered a shower or been able to brush my teeth. There is no soap, and our clothes are dirty. They have never been washed.

Finally, here are the words of a 17-year-old mother:

I was given a blanket and a mattress, but then, at 3 a.m., the guards took the blanket and mattress. My baby was left sleeping on the floor. In fact, almost every night, the guards wake us at 3 a.m. and take away our sleeping mattresses and blankets. . . . They leave babies, even little babies of 2 or 3 months, sleeping on the cold floor. For me, because I am so pregnant, sleeping on the floor is very painful for my back and hips. I think the guards act this way to punish us.

This is not the America I know. Yet this administration wants us to forget who we are. This administration wants us to believe that if the Government of the United States is cruel enough, that if it denies those who seek asylum all semblances of humanity, that if we ignore basic standards of child welfare, and that if we abandon fundamental American values like respect for human rights, then desperate families who flee Central America will stop coming here.

It is not true. The entire doctrine of deterrence is grounded in hideous lies, beginning with the lie the President has fed the people from the moment he launched his campaign in 2015—the lie that immigrants are a threat to our security. President Trump has cast immigrants as criminals and rapists and drug dealers when the truth is that these migrants are the ones who are fleeing the criminals, the rapists, and the drug dealers.

I am sick and tired of these lies, like when the President repeatedly says he inherited the policy of family separation from the Obama administration. That is a lie. The Trump administration masterminded this despicable policy, pure and simple.

These cruel policies are not working. They have done nothing to stem the tide of families who seek asylum in the United States. They have done nothing to stabilize Central America and to alleviate the conditions that force families to seek refuge here.

It is time to turn the page. There are so many alternatives to detention that are available to the DHS that are far more humane and far less costly to the taxpayers.

Consider the Obama administration's pilot program known as the family case management system. It established procedures to treat migrant fam-

ilies humanely as their cases moved forward. Pregnant women, nursing mothers, or mothers with young children were given caseworkers who helped to educate them on their rights and their responsibilities. They were connected to community resources or to family in the country who could help them.

According to an inspector general's report, the program was an enormous success. It had a compliance rate of 99 percent. That means that 99 percent of the time, families in the program showed up for their ICE check-ins and appointments. Likewise, they showed up 100 percent of the time for their immigration court hearings. Tell me—how many government programs work 100 percent of the time? It is very rare. This one did, but that didn't stop President Trump from terminating it. Even though it had a 99-percent compliance and check-in rate and had 100 percent who showed up for their hearings, oh, no. Evidently, that was not good enough for the Trump administration, for it was far more humane and far less costly to the taxpayers.

Beyond embracing alternatives to mass detention, we must ramp up humanitarian assistance at the border. That is why I voted yesterday for the House's emergency supplemental bill, which would provide desperately needed support to on-the-ground organizations and would better ensure the humane treatment of children who are in CBP custody.

The House bill included strong guardrails to prevent this White House from using these funds to pursue its draconian detention practices and mass deportation agenda. While the Senate bill fell short in these areas, I hope the administration uses whatever money it receives to ensure that the children are properly cared for—in a way that respects basic human rights.

Solving this crisis will take more than humanitarian funding. If President Trump were serious about reducing migration, he would be working day and night to improve the conditions that are driving families to flee Central America in the first place. Instead, he has cut off aid to the Northern Triangle and has undermined critical U.S. efforts to work with Central American governments to crack down on gang violence, strengthen the rule of law, and alleviate poverty.

These programs were working, and the Trump administration knows it. Why do I say that? In recent years, Congress has not only increased funding for foreign assistance to Central America, but it has required these governments to meet clear benchmarks in order to demonstrate their progress in areas like combating drug trafficking and strengthening their legal systems.

The Trump administration has acknowledged the effectiveness of these programs on several occasions. In fact, it has sent Congress not one, not two, but nine different reports that have certified these benchmarks have been met.

Here is just one of them that has been signed by Secretary of State Mike Pompeo:

I hereby certify that the central government of El Salvador is informing its citizens of the dangers of the journey to the southwest border of the United States; combating human smuggling and trafficking; improving border security, including preventing illegal migration, human smuggling and trafficking, and trafficking of illicit drugs and other contraband; and cooperating with the United States Government agencies and other governments in the region to facilitate the return, repatriation, and reintegration of illegal migrants arriving at the southwest border of the United States who do not qualify for asylum consistent with international law.

This one is dated August 11, 2018. There are nine certifications by the Secretary of State saying that the programs we had going on and working in Central America were, in fact, working.

But we all know this President has no respect for facts or evidence-based reality. His decision to punish Central American governments for the migration crisis by slashing aid is only making the crisis worse. It absolutely makes no sense.

If we want to reduce migration from Central America, we need a bold strategy to address the root causes driving families in fear from their home. That is why my colleagues and I have introduced the Central America Reform and Enforcement Act. Our bill would dramatically expand U.S. engagement in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala through proven programs that help strengthen the rule of law, combat violence, and build prosperity. Our bill would also minimize border crossings by expanding refugee processing centers in the region in an effort to reduce demand at the border, and, finally, it includes several measures to protect the welfare of children and ensure efficient, fair, and timely processing of asylum seekers.

Now, this administration may wish the Northern Triangle's serious problems would just go away, but the longer we let these conditions fester, the greater this migration crisis will become.

There is a very real possibility that President Trump views a growing crisis at the border as an asset in his path to reelection in 2020. The President believes his best shot at winning elections is to stoke fear of migrant children who pose no threat but desperately need the safe embrace of Lady Liberty.

After all, President Trump cannot campaign on solving the student loan debt crisis or providing Americans with better, cheaper healthcare, or making sure that big corporations pay their fair share. He has failed on all these fronts and more. The only play left in the Trump playbook is to blame immigrants for America's problems instead of solving America's problems.

That is what I call the politics of hate. The politics of hate is what led

President Trump to attempt to ban Muslims from traveling to the United States. The politics of hate is what led President Trump to end DACA and threaten 800,000 Dreamers with deportation to countries they have never called home—young people who through no choice of their own were brought to the United States, the only country they have ever pledged allegiance to is the United States and to the flag of the United States. The only national anthem they know is the Star Spangled Banner. The only place they have ever called home is America.

The politics of hate is what led President Trump to attack TPS holders and jeopardize thousands of parents to American-born children. The politics of hate is what led the administration to forcibly separate nearly 2,800 children from their parents—and maybe thousands more, because they don't even have a recordkeeping system of where all of these children are. That is a policy that will forever be a stain on our history.

The politics of hate is what led President Trump to tweet out his plan to send ICE agents into our communities to terrorize our towns and cities with mass arrests and mass deportations. It is a plan that would leave millions of U.S.-born American citizen children wondering: Why mom never came to pick me up at school or why dad never made it home for dinner. It is a plan that would inflict traumatic and irreparable harm on American children who would not only have to reckon with the loss of a parent but the loss of the income provided by that parent. The politics of hate led to the remain-in-Mexico policy, which forces asylum seekers to remain in Mexico amid dangerous conditions.

Indeed, just yesterday, U.S. asylum officers requested that the courts block the Trump administration from requiring migrants to stay in Mexico, stating it is "fundamentally contrary to the moral fabric of our Nation and our international domestic legal obligations."

Now, in the latest action, I fear it is the politics of hate that explain the awful press reports we heard today suggesting that President Trump plans to end a program that protects undocumented members of U.S. military families from deportation. Imagine that—someone who wears the uniform of the United States, who may serve halfway around the world in service to the Nation, who risks their lives, and now you are going to take the one program that put their mind at ease—that their spouse or child, who may be undocumented in the country and had the ability to stay because of that service-member's service, and now you are going to say you are going to deport their children, their spouse.

Well, if someone is willing to wear the uniform of the United States, pledge allegiance to our flag, and risk their life to defend this Nation in battle, the last thing we ought to do is to deport their loved ones.

The Trump administration's policies at our border have brought us nothing but chaos, despair, and shame. We cannot let the politics of fear and hate degrade the values that make America great.

We cannot wall off our country from the strife gripping Central America. We cannot tweet our way out of this problem. We must lead our way out of this problem with real solutions and strategies that bring sanity, dignity, and order back to our border and prevent the kind of tragic loss of human life we saw earlier this week on the banks of the Rio Grande. We are just better than this. We are just better than this.

If my colleagues do not raise their voices, then, they are complicit to this. History will judge us poorly.

I hope we will have bipartisan voices who say: This is not who we are; this is not what we stand for. And we can work toward making sure this tragic photograph never ever happens again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

#### IMMIGRATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I was coming to floor today to talk about legislation we just got passed in the last week in the Homeland Security Committee with the hopes that I can convince some of my colleagues to join us in this effort, and I will talk about that bill in a moment. But first let me, if I could, address the photograph and the comments from my colleague from New Jersey.

He showed a tragic photograph that so many of my constituents and all Americans have seen—Oscar Alberto Martinez Ramirez and his daughter Valeria, facedown in the Rio Grande.

This man came from El Salvador. We don't know all the details yet, but clearly he was interested in coming to the United States and applying for asylum, as so many others have come—hundreds a day, thousands a week, hundreds of thousands a month now, overwhelming the infrastructure at the border, pulling 40 to 60 percent of our Border Patrol off the border to deal with the humanitarian crisis that has occurred.

That tragic photograph—and it is a horrific photo of a daughter clinging to her father's neck, having drowned in the Rio Grande coming over from Mexico—should be a wake-up call. I agree with that, but it should not be a wake-up call to have us continue to point fingers around here at the other side and blame someone else for the problem. It should instead be a wake-up call for solutions—for bipartisan solutions—because that is all that works to be able to resolve these issues.

I hope the first step will be taken today, because I just learned, as I came to the floor, that the House of Representatives is now considering taking up the legislation we passed here in the

Senate just yesterday. It provides immediate emergency funds for humanitarian assistance at the border that is needed right now. We passed it with over 80 votes here in the Senate—82 votes, with 9 of our Members absent, I believe. Over 82 votes is very unusual for anything to pass around here, particularly something so substantial.

It is bipartisan. It came out of the Appropriations Committee with a 30-to-1 vote to get these funds and these resources down to the border now to help with this true humanitarian crisis that we are facing. Everyone must acknowledge that.

The House was balking at that. They were sending us another bill that had some partisan elements to it that no Republican could support in the House—not a single one.

Finally, I think they have decided to pick up our bipartisan bill and pass it, and thank God, because now the President can sign it and that aid can go down to our border immediately where it is needed.

But I have to be frank with you. That humanitarian aid going down to the border is not enough because I don't think it would have had an impact on the tragic photograph that was talked about on the floor earlier.

That incident did not occur because of the lack of humanitarian aid that is badly needed. That incident occurred because there is this pull factor to come to our country, particularly from these Northern Triangle countries—Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador. This particular gentleman, Oscar Alberto Martinez Ramirez, came from El Salvador.

Then, there are push factors from those countries. And, again, this is causing so many families to come here, so many unaccompanied children to come here from these three countries in Central America.

The traffickers are telling them: If you come to America and you ask for asylum, you will be let in.

Let's be frank. These countries are countries that have real challenges and real problems.

My colleague from New Jersey is right. We have sent a lot of American taxpayer dollars down to those countries, and he noted that the reports back from the administration and others are positive, saying it is beginning to make a difference. He noted that that funding is now being reduced or even eliminated in some cases, but it was during the time when that funding was there that the people started coming.

So, yes, we should have more funding that is effective for those countries. I agree with that. The Millennium Challenge Corporation funding is the new way we send that funding. It is more effective because it says: What are you doing in Central America to improve your infrastructure, your conditions, your judicial system, your rule of law, and to fight corruption? We need to do all those things.

But let's be frank. Let's be honest. We have been doing that, and yet the push factor is still there.

So I believe it is part of the answer, but I don't think logic applied to this situation means that you could say that it is all of the answer because we have been doing it.

My taxpayers and other taxpayers, I think, around this country are willing to do more, but they also want to deal with the pull factor, and the pull factor is very simple. If you come to America and you apply for asylum right now, with the system being overwhelmed and with certain laws in place, including a court decision, you are released into the community, meaning you come into America. Most of the court cases that deal with whether you are successful or not in your asylum claim take over 2 years now. It takes over 2 years until you are before a judge for a hearing.

When those court cases occur, we are told on the Homeland Security Committee, that about 15 percent of those individuals are granted asylum—15 percent.

Now, in America, our wages are 10 to 20 times higher than they are in these Northern Triangle countries—El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras. Is it any wonder that they come here seeking a better way of life? No, you would too. But we have to have a system of laws here in this country where, yes, we accept refugees and, yes, we accept people who have claims of asylum that are granted, but we don't have open borders.

We have a system here, a system of laws, and it has clearly broken down now. Again, thousands come in every week, hundreds of thousands every month—mostly families, mostly children because of the way our laws work. I don't think we should be separating families, by the way. So, if you have a child with you or you are a child, then under a court decision you could be held only for a short period of time, 20 days maximum, in emergency situations. What happens is that people are released into the community.

I will be frank with you. From what we have heard from Customs and Border Protection and from the Department of Health and Human Services, which are responsible for many of these detention facilities, they are so overwhelmed, they don't even have room for 20 days, so people are allowed to come into the community. Again, the court cases happen a long time after that, and people are granted work permits. That is why people are coming. It is a pull. They are saying: If you get to America, we will get you in.

These traffickers are charging a lot of money. It is horrible. They are taking mortgages on people's homes. They are saying "We will take half your pay for the next year," promising things that are frankly beyond what can be accomplished.

A situation in Ohio occurred a couple years ago with kids from Guatemala.

Unaccompanied kids coming from Guatemala were told: You can get in. It is good. We will take care of you. In this case, the traffickers took mortgages on the parents' homes. They brought these kids to the United States, to the Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, detention facility. They were then sent out to sponsor families, which is what they do. They take these minor children, underaged, and send them to sponsor families. Sometimes they can find families; sometimes they can't. In this case, our own government sent these kids back to the traffickers because the traffickers applied for the very kids they had brought up from Guatemala.

Despite claims and promises to their parents that they would get a good education with a family taking care of these kids, do you know what they did with these kids? They put them on an egg farm in Ohio—underage kids—and exploited them. They took away their pay, had them live in conditions none of us would find acceptable for any member of our family. They had them living in trailers, some of them under trailers, on mattresses without sheets, working 12 hours a day. Some of these kids were working 6 days a week, some 7 days a week. This is not America. Yet this was happening. Again, our system is broken. These traffickers were exploiting these children.

Finally, in this case, law enforcement stepped in, and we have been able to indict and convict the traffickers. Thank goodness. But this is not a situation that can or should continue.

In the tragic photo of the story I just told, the answer is not politically pointing fingers. Blaming Donald Trump isn't going to solve this problem. We need as a body to change the laws. We need as a body to provide more effective aid to those countries. That is true. The push factors and the pull factors both need to be addressed. But if we just play politics with this on both sides, we will have more unnecessary deaths. We will have more tragic situations.

Again, I had planned to come and talk about something else, and I will, briefly. But I must say, with regard to this immigration challenge we face as a country, I hope the tragedy we have now all seen online and on TV serves as a wake-up call to get to bipartisan solutions that actually help solve this problem and stop the push factors and the pull factors that will continue to bring hundreds of thousands of people from these three countries to our border, which has overwhelmed us.

Today there is a start. Today there is a start with the humanitarian aid package. Thank goodness.

Tomorrow we need to get to work to talk about these bigger problems. I will say, I have worked on this with some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I heard the words today from my colleague from New Jersey about refugee processing centers. I think that is part of the answer. In the Obama ad-

ministration, you could apply for refugee status from your country—El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras—and not come to the border. The refugee criteria is almost identical to the criteria for asylum. The United Nations does this all over the world. I agree, that is a much better solution.

Let's have these processing centers in the Northern Triangle countries. Let's have one in Mexico, maybe one in Mexico at the southern border with Guatemala, maybe one at the northern border of the United States. Let's deal with this processing problem. Let's determine who is qualified, who has a legitimate fear of persecution. Again, 15 percent of them are now being granted. The other 85 percent are not. For the others, we have to say: You can apply to come to the United States as everybody else does, from Mexico, from the Philippines, from India, from countries in Africa, and we need to continue to be a generous country with regard to immigration. But we have to have a system of laws, and we have to stop these tragedies where people are being told by traffickers: You can make this journey to the north. It will be fine.

It is not fine. It is arduous, it is dangerous, and you see the results.

The trafficking that is going on of girls and women is all part of this too. It is not going to stop unless we as a group here in Congress, on a bipartisan basis, deal not just with the push factors but also the pull factors and deal with them realistically.

#### NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, the legislation I came to the floor to talk about today passed in the Homeland Security Committee last week to help make our synagogues, our churches, our mosques, and other nonprofit institutions safer.

Sadly, we have seen a troubling pattern in recent years. Hate-fueled attacks at houses of worship and religious institutions, not just in our country but around the world, are becoming more and more common. A couple of months ago, a shooting at a synagogue outside San Diego took the life of Lori Gilbert Kaye, who heroically sacrificed herself to save her rabbi. Exactly 6 months to the day prior to that, the shooting at the Tree of Life synagogue outside of Pittsburgh, PA, claimed 11 lives, the worst act of anti-Semitic violence in U.S. history.

Sometimes this hate is manifested in other ways: bomb threats at the Jewish Community Center in Columbus, OH, and anti-Semitic graffiti sprayed on the Hebrew Union College walls in my hometown of Cincinnati, OH.

Right after the attacks on the synagogue in Pittsburgh last year, I went to the Jewish Community Center in Youngstown, OH, only 60 miles away from Pittsburgh, to meet with Jewish community leaders. An attack on one is an attack on all. We must all stand up.

In Youngstown that somber day, we talked about where we go from here to stop anti-Semitism and hatred. I asked them for input about what the Federal Government can do to help keep the Jewish community safe. Part of the input I got was that we need more help on best practices on security and more resources to protect our community centers, our schools, our churches, our synagogues, our mosques.

The resurgence of this anti-Semitism must be confronted and defeated with all the energy we can bring to bear. But sadly, it is not just related to the Jewish community, which has known it for over the centuries. Hate seldom stops at one religion or one country.

Hundreds of Christians in Sri Lanka were massacred in churches and hotels on Easter Sunday. In New Zealand, the shooting at the mosques in Christchurch killed at least 49 people. We will never forget the 2015 tragic killings of African-American parishioners at Emmanuel AME Church in Charleston, SC, where I have visited and prayed, or the 2017 attacks on the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, TX.

While I have highlighted unconscionable mass murders, there are so many other examples of vandalism and harassment. We saw this in my home State of Ohio this February, where a man holding a gun smashed the windows of a mosque in Dayton while worshippers were praying inside. We saw it in Louisiana this April when three historically Black churches were deliberately burned down within the same parish. This violence is senseless and contrary to our values as Americans.

Our first obligation as Americans and certainly as public officials is to stand up and say this must stop. Stop the hate—not just partisan finger-pointing but a single, unified message. Targeted communities cannot stop it on their own. We must remind all of our fellow citizens that we are all made in the image of God, and the anti-Semitism, the hatred, and the violence are not acceptable in this country.

Sadly, if these trends are any indication, we also have to recognize these attacks are likely to continue, and I think Congress can and should do more to provide synagogues, mosques, churches, and other faith-based organizations with best practices and more resources to secure their facilities effectively.

Based in part on the input I received in Youngstown that sad day, I have been the leading supporter of the Nonprofit Security Grant Program. This grant program allows nonprofits, including synagogues and other faith-based organizations, to apply for funds they can use to access best practices to secure their facilities and to train personnel.

Some good news came out recently. Under the new Department of Homeland Security rules, nonprofits are now permitted to hire armed security personnel with these funds. That is some-

thing I had promoted. I think it is a good idea because it is needed. Last year, I led a bipartisan letter with Senator CASEY to push for a total of \$60 million for the program nationwide. I am happy to say that funding level was incorporated in the final Homeland Security appropriations bill.

This year, I am working with my colleagues to actually authorize this program to be sure it will be there in the future and to increase the amount of funding in the program to \$75 million so that nonprofits outside of the largest urban areas—which are currently being served through the initial program—also have access to this funding. Unfortunately, in a lot of instances I talked about earlier, it was not in major urban centers. So it is being spread well beyond our big cities.

To support that effort, my colleague Senator GARY PETERS and I have introduced bipartisan legislation called the Protecting Faith-Based and Nonprofit Organizations from Terrorism Act to provide best practices and more funding for hardening vulnerable nonprofits and faith-based institutions and for training resources for those congregations.

The bill authorizes \$75 million annually for the next 5 years, \$50 million to be used by nonprofits located within high-risk, large urban areas, and the rest will be available for nonprofits in other areas.

I am pleased to report that the Homeland Security Committee unanimously approved this bill last week. I look forward to its coming to the floor, where I hope it can be passed on a bipartisan basis. While our bill is pending, I hope my colleagues in the Appropriations Committee will once again be receptive to the letter and spirit of our bill to make those resources available to urban and nonurban areas alike.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that the thousands of religious and other nonprofit institutions in Ohio and across our country are safe and welcoming places. I pray we will see the day when such security grants are not necessary because we will abide by the admonition to love our neighbors as ourselves. But in the meantime, let's do what we can to give our communities the know-how, the resources, and the best practices so they can be safer and more secure.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### FISCAL CHALLENGES

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his outstanding comments on faith-biased security and the immigration crisis that we are facing and the solutions he suggested. We have a lot of work to do there.

Now you get to hear from the accountant.

I come to the floor today to call attention to the Federal Government's unsustainable fiscal outlook.

Yesterday in the Senate Budget Committee we had a hearing on fixing our broken budget and spending process, with a focus on securing our country's fiscal future. Our witness was the Comptroller General of the United States, the head of the Government Accountability Office.

In April of this year, GAO issued its third annual update on the nation's fiscal health. The report concluded that the Federal Government is on an unsustainable fiscal path.

A Congressional Budget Office report released this week on the long-term budget outlook painted a similarly bleak picture, noting that our surging Federal debt is putting our Nation at risk of a "fiscal crisis." This is one of the charts we got to see. I know it is pretty hard for people to read. We are figuring out a way to make this bigger.

The impact will be tremendous. It shows that, in 2019, Social Security spending passed the \$1 trillion mark annually. In 2021, the highway trust fund will be unable to meet all obligations. In 2022, the discretionary spending caps will expire, allowing unlimited spending. In 2025, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation multiemployer fund will be depleted. It will be insufficient to pay full benefits to insolvent pension plans. In 2025, CBO projects the net interest spending will surpass the spending on national defense. In 2026, the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund will be depleted. With some incoming revenue, it will be sufficient to pay 91 percent of hospital-related Medicare spending, which is already forced to be low.

In 2030, the net interest spending will exceed \$1 trillion annually. The interest will exceed \$1 trillion annually.

In 2031, mandatory spending and interest will consume all Federal revenue. It means we will not get to make any decisions on anything that isn't mandatory, which we don't get to make decisions on right now.

In 2032, the Social Security trust fund will be depleted. The amount of money coming in that will be paid out right away will only pay 77 percent of the scheduled benefits. I will cover that more later.

Those are a few of the fiscal cliffs we are facing that could be solved now, that have to be solved now. If they are solved now, they have simpler, less impactful problems than if we wait until the cliff gets here.

The Federal Government is swimming in a sea of red ink that threatens to drown America's future generations. If current laws don't change, debt as a percentage of GDP, will soar to unprecedented levels over the next 30 years. Let me repeat that. If current laws don't change, debt as a percentage of GDP—that is production—will soar to unprecedented levels over the next 30 years. By 2037, our debt-to-GDP ratio—that is debt-to-production—will surpass the historical records set in the aftermath of World War II. By 2049, debt will stand at 144 percent of GDP.

That is how bond investors determine the likelihood of getting their money back. Interest rates reflect that fact and go up as risk increases. As that percentage goes up, the risk increases. The amount we have to pay to borrow any money will go up, if people still loan us money, which gets us to what is on the chart.

In 2030, net interest will exceed \$1 trillion a year annually. That is not buying anything; that is paying the interest.

In most of the Nation's history, we have only seen periods of high spending and debt during wars and other emergencies, and the increase has been temporary, but today's fiscal situation is different.

We are facing a demographic fiscal storm. For decades, nonpartisan experts, including the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office, have warned of the budget pressures that we would face as baby boomers aged and began to retire. We heard yesterday from the GAO that, on average, more than 10,000 people per day turn 65 years of age, and in the next few years, that number will rise to more than 11,000. Here is a little chart of how those thousands per day grow.

Some of us were under the impression, of course, that the baby boomers eventually would die. That is kind of an inevitable sort of thing. What we didn't count on was the extra longevity that everybody will have and the fact that there are other generations coming up. So the chart does not tail off here on the end. The chart continues to grow, even though the birth rate is down.

The combination of aging population, longer lifespans, and rising per-beneficiary healthcare costs put enormous pressure on our spending.

According to the CBO, the projected explosion in debt we will see over the next few decades and beyond occurs because of mandatory spending—particularly Social Security and major healthcare programs, specifically, Medicare and Medicaid—not to mention the interest payments on the national debt that will permanently grow faster than Federal revenues.

This autospent money—spending that is never looked at—has already grown from about 36 percent of the Federal budget 50 years ago to 70 percent today. If left unchecked, CBO projects that more than 80 cents of every dollar the government spends will be on mandatory spending, guaranteed to be spent without further approval, not to mention the interest by 2049.

Because mandatory spending operates on autopilot, not subject to the annual appropriations process, it often escapes congressional scrutiny and proper oversight. It would be one thing if mandatory spending programs bypassed the appropriations process because they were fully funded through their own dedicated source of revenue, but that is not the case.

As this chart shows, many of the largest mandatory programs, such as Medicaid and food stamps, don't have their own source of funding and instead rely entirely on money from the Treasury's general fund. You can see the blue here. That is money that will be coming in. The red is the extra money that has to be spent to meet the obligations. On some of these, you will note that there is no blue at all. That means this is coming out of the general fund, which is where we expect to be able to get defense, education, and all of the other things we do. So there is enough spent right here on excess that doesn't have a source of revenue that forces everything else we do to be borrowed, and I already mentioned the problems of borrowing.

Even though some of these programs do collect some revenue—and a few of them do collect their own revenue—they often spend more than they take in. It didn't used to be the case. We used to have a lot more people working and paying into Social Security than were receiving Social Security, and there used to be a huge surplus, which we spent and then put as bonds in the drawer. We are now drawing down on those bonds, even though there is no real money to back them up, but that is about to be depleted as well.

Over the next 10 years, CBO projects that Social Security spending will total \$14.4 trillion, but the program's dedicated tax revenues will only cover \$11.8 trillion of that. That is \$14.4 trillion going out and \$11.8 trillion coming in. You can't do that very long.

CBO projects that under current law, Social Security's combined trust funds would be exhausted through 2032. You may say: That is a long time into the future, 2032. Well, that is 3 years earlier than the Social Security trustees estimated just earlier this year. How many times can we have that accelerated by 3 years before we are at the cliff?

Total Medicare spending will amount to \$11.5 trillion over the next 10 years, but the program just collects \$6 trillion in dedicated taxes and premiums—again, \$11.5 trillion going out and \$6 trillion coming in.

CBO and the Medicare trustees both projected Medicare's Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, which covers inpatient hospital services, hospice care, skilled nursing facilities, and home health services, will be depleted in 2026.

Spending on military and civilian retirement programs will total nearly \$2 trillion, but Federal employees' contributions toward their pension will only be \$70 billion. I don't like that word "trillion." It is kind of hard to wrap your head around it. Billions are tough enough, but \$2 trillion is \$2,000 billion. That is what is going out, \$2,000 billion. What is coming in is \$70 billion. There is a little bit of a gap. Just as with most other spending programs, this difference will be made up with general fund revenues, which today are all borrowed funds.

Social Security and much of Medicare is supposed to be different though. Under current law, once their respective trust funds are exhausted, those programs will still pay out money, but they will only be able to pay out as much in benefits as they have coming in. We heard yesterday from the Government Accountability Office that, for Medicare, that means only being able to pay 91 cents on the dollar for hospital-related Medicare spending. How long do you think doctors will put up with that? How many hospitals will that put out of business? For Social Security, revenue is projected to be sufficient to cover only 77 percent of scheduled benefits. Who on Social Security will be able to afford a cut of 23 percent? That is the fiscal cliff.

Of course, this shouldn't be news to lawmakers. For years, the warnings that these programs are on an unsustainable fiscal course have gone largely unheeded, hoping that the next Congress, the next President, or maybe the next generation would be more willing to deal with the problem.

To be clear, I want to make sure Social Security and Medicare are able to continue providing benefits to current beneficiaries, as well as those who may need these programs in the future. That will require us to work together in a bipartisan manner to ensure these programs' solvency. If we don't make changes to the way these programs currently operate, a lot of people in the future will just be out of luck. There are levers that can be pulled on these. If any one is pulled, it would be a tragedy to whomever it affects. If they are all pulled, it is less noticeable but still noticeable based on how long it is before we ever reach a solution on these problems.

Ignoring the problem will not make it go away and, in this case, the opposite is true. The longer we wait to address this imbalance, the more severe the changes will need to be, and we will have fewer options.

We need to change the way we do things around here. Too often we wait to make the difficult decisions that everyone knows has to be made until we have a crisis on our hands. In the Budget Committee, we are focused on trying to put together bipartisan budget process reform proposals that will help us confront these thorny fiscal issues in a more reasoned, timely, and responsible way.

I am hopeful we will get there. I am encouraged with the conversations we have had that we will get there. These issues are too important to ignore, and we are going to need to work together if we are to put our country on a more sustainable fiscal course. We owe it to future generations to try.

We have handled some crises around here. Recently, we handled one of national disasters. The national disasters don't have to be paid for. They aren't a part of the budget caps—they should be a part of the budget caps, but they don't have to be a part of the budget

caps—so they just get exempt as long as they are voted on, but everybody wants to help everybody with a problem, so we go ahead and pass those straight to debt. One week, at the beginning of the week, when we proposed it, it was \$13 billion. When it actually passed it, it was up to \$19.1 billion. That all went to additional debt.

It is a crisis. We need to plan for it. We need to prioritize for it. We need to fit that in, but we can't do everything, continue to escalate everything, and consider that things we haven't look at for years are OK to keep doing the same way we are doing them or to have the duplication. We are doing hearings all the time on ways this problem can be solved, but it is important that we start solving it soon or future generations will be drastically affected.

In fact, the dates I had up here earlier, present generations will be affected. We need to get everyone on board looking for solutions and biting the bullet now to do them.

I have had a penny plan for a long time. Under the penny plan, if we just stopped spending 1 cent out of every dollar we spend, not counting Social Security, no change in Social Security—if we just found ways to do things 1 percent better, and we did that for 7 consecutive years, our budget would balance. If we started with a penny, I am pretty sure we would say: That really didn't hurt too bad. How about if we do 2 cents? Now we cut it back to 4 years, and we can start paying down debt, which we have to do for our future generations, if our kids and grandkids are going to have the kind of life we had.

I am working for and hoping for everybody working together to solve these problems. If we just talk about them, and we don't work on them, it is pretty depressing but not as depressing as it will be hurting.

I ask my colleagues to take a look at this and help come up with solutions. I am impressed with those who are working with me on it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I sit here every Thursday from 3 o'clock to 6 o'clock and hear several speeches that are made. I happen to sit on the Budget Committee with Chairman ENZI. I hope everyone listened carefully to what he just said. The Comptroller General was in yesterday.

One of the reasons I ran for Senate is that being a Main Street entrepreneur from Indiana, you never could have gotten by with the way this place runs its business. The Federal Government

is somewhere around six to seven times the size of Walmart and runs its business by the seat of its pants, in the sense that we have not done a budget that we have appropriated in nearly 20 years.

If you listened closely, you know we have some hard deadlines. The chairman referred to it as cliffs. Well, sometimes that is so figurative that you don't believe it is going to happen or that it is going to be real. These are things we are going to have to contend with.

When the Medicare fund is depleted fully in 2026, benefits get cut immediately. Social Security is farther down the trail, and there are going to be all kinds of issues. We are lucky, currently, that other countries and our own citizens will lend us money when we run trillion-dollar deficits routinely.

He mentioned the "Penny Plan." In any business, if you were charged with fixing your company's problems by cutting back by either freezing expenses by a 1-percent cut or a 2-percent cut, that would be done easily because you have hard accountability. If you would perform in a business or a State government like we do here, I can guarantee you there wouldn't be a lender that would let you perpetuate and keep doing it. The fact that we have a credit card that we can put it on year after year eliminates the accountability that you have anywhere else.

I was on a school board for 10 years. I was in State government in Indiana, where we always have a cash balance and operate in the black and have a balanced budget. Even though we do that so routinely there, we passed a balanced budget amendment to our State constitution simply because government, even in a place like Indiana, oftentimes views how they spend the people's money different, and this place does it worse than any other place in the country.

So do we want to get to the point where we deplete the Medicare trust fund and where we run out of funds to pay pensioners or do we want to make the hard decisions?

It is funny. When I got here, I looked at the budget process. Budgets, even though they are not adhered to, might be a resolution, and it is not the law. Always, even if they do incorporate savings, you never see it until year 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Well, again, in the real world, if you are running at a 20-percent loss on your P&L, you do not have the luxury to wait 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 years to fix it.

I ask the American public to hold their Senators accountable and their congressmen, because this time, unlike in 2008, which we all know was bad enough, the main people holding the bag will be retirees and the elderly who depend on the government for healthcare, and individuals who depend on healthcare who are not well to do, through Medicaid, will be left holding the bag.

Only 22 Republicans—it should have been all 53 of us who were on the Penny Plan bill that Senator PAUL put out just a few weeks ago, but only 22 of our own conference, which talks about fiscal conservatism—got on that bill. I would hope that the American public holds their representatives accountable so that we don't hit the cliff and go over it and pay the consequences, which will be dear.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks while seated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTE TO GARY WOODLAND

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, while my remarks in front of me say "I rise today," I sit today on this Senate floor to congratulate a Topeka, KS, native, a 2019 U.S. Open champion, Gary Woodland.

Gary Woodland grew up in Topeka and attended Shawnee Heights High School. After high school, Gary attended Washburn University on a full basketball scholarship before transferring to the University of Kansas to join the golf team. This U.S. Open was the first major championship victory of Gary Woodland's career, and Gary made history by becoming the first graduate of the University of Kansas to ever win a PGA major tournament.

Gary's performance at Pebble Beach was truly elite. He scored under par in all four rounds, including an impressive 6-under-par 65 in the second round. On Sunday's final round, Gary battled the elements and a late surge by last year's U.S. Open champion, Brooks Koepka. On hole 18, Gary sunk a long birdie putt to solidify his win at 13 strokes under par, 1 stroke better than Tiger Woods' historic 2000 U.S. Open victory at Pebble Beach.

I congratulate Gary on this historic win, but I also recognize his actions off the course. Gary is an advocate for Special Olympics and also partners with Folds of Honor, a nonprofit organization that grants scholarships to family members of U.S. servicemembers. Gary even wore patriotic golf gear to honor our troops and Folds of Honor at the U.S. Open. After the win, Gary thanked our troops for their service and stated: "There's men and women who sacrifice and do so much for us so I can go out and play a game of golf and live my life under freedom."

The final round also coincides with Father's Day, and this undoubtedly made this championship even more significant as Gary's father watched him sink the final putt on 18. Gary said, after his win, that his dad worked nights so he could pursue his love of sports and spend time with him during the day.

I recognize Gary, but I also want to recognize the entire Woodland family—

his parents, Dana and Linda; his wife, Gabby; his son, Jaxson; and the twin girls they are expecting. This is a tremendous achievement.

Kansans are extremely proud of you, Gary. We wish you and your family the best of luck moving forward, and we will continue to root for your success.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks on the floor, Senator BROWN resume his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE FREEDOM TO NEGOTIATE ACT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, conservative, rightwing forces in our country are engaged in an all-out assault on working people. Their target? Private and public sector workers and the unions who are fighting on their behalf. While private sector unions at least have some protections under the National Labor Relations Act, public employees have been historically forced to rely on Supreme Court precedent to protect their basic rights.

That is why the Court's decision last year in *Janus* was so damaging. In one fell swoop, the Court overturned more than 40 years of precedent from the *Abood* decision and barred public sector unions from collecting fair share fees from employees who had opted out of the union but whom the union is still legally required to represent.

The Supreme Court's decision in *Janus* was not unexpected. Its decision was the culmination of decades-long efforts by groups like the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation to undermine settled precedent in *Abood* in order to weaken public sector unions. These groups worked methodically to achieve their goals.

First, Justice Alito all but invited a challenge to *Abood* when he wrote his decision in *Knox v. SEIU Local 100* and *Harris v. Quinn*. He called the justification for allowing a union to collect fair share fees "an anomaly." He said "the *Abood* Court's analysis is questionable on several grounds" and laid out the grounds as he saw them for someone to bring a case to overturn *Abood*.

This was an open invitation to conservative groups to then go looking for a plaintiff to do just that—to create an opportunity for the Supreme Court to overturn *Abood*. They funded *Friedrichs v. California Teachers Association*, which was fast-tracked to the

Supreme Court in 2016, where "the signaler," Justice Alito, awaited the case. Public employee unions received a temporary reprieve in a deadlocked 4-to-4 decision because of Justice Antonin Scalia's unexpected death.

The well-funded conservative interests then saw a huge opportunity to fill the vacancy with a Justice to their liking. From applauding Senator MCCONNELL's single-handedly blocking the nomination of Merrick Garland to spending millions to confirm Neil Gorsuch, they wanted a Justice who was on their side.

They got it in Neil Gorsuch, who delivered the decisive fifth vote in *Janus*, torpedoing 41 years of precedent under the pretext of protecting "fundamental free speech rights." Justice Elena Kagan saw right through this argument. In a strong dissent, she said: "The majority overthrows a decision entrenched in this Nation's law . . . for over 40 years . . . and it does so by weaponizing the First Amendment, in a way that unleashes judges, now and in the future, to intervene in economic and regulatory policy."

Undermining public employee unions and, in fact, all unions has gained momentum because of the conservative majority on the Supreme Court. With this narrow majority, we are likely to see a lot more 5-to-4 decisions on ideological, partisan lines. This is not good for the country and not good for the credibility of the Court. We need a Supreme Court that strives to achieve consensus as often as possible, not one pursuing a hard-right ideological agenda.

In the face of these onslaughts from the Supreme Court and conservative interests, unions are fighting back. We have seen tens of thousands of teachers taking to the streets in cities and States across the country demanding and in many cases securing more investment in schools, smaller class sizes, and a living wage for teachers.

In the year since *Janus*, public sector employee unions like AFSCME are adding thousands of new dues-paying members energized to fight back against the conservative assault on unions' very existence.

Our public employee unions are doing their job to stay in the fight and Congress needs to do its part. That is why I joined 35 of my Senate colleagues and 27 of my House colleagues this week to introduce the Public Service Freedom to Negotiate Act of 2019.

This legislation affirms to all 17.3 million public sector workers nationwide that we value their service to the public and that we are fighting to protect their voice in the workplace.

Our bill codifies the right of public employees to organize, act concertedly, and bargain collectively in States that currently do not afford these basic rights.

Under our legislation, States have wide flexibility to write and administer their own labor laws, provided they meet the standards established in this

legislation, and it will not preempt laws in States that substantially meet or exceed this standard.

The right to organize shouldn't depend on whether or not your State has robust worker protections, like the State of Hawaii, and workers shouldn't be held captive to the anti-union bent of the Roberts Five on the Supreme Court.

The fight to protect the right to organize is not an abstract issue. Unions have lifted people into the middle class, especially women and people of color.

I speak from personal experience. When I was a young child, my mother worked for years in low-wage jobs that provided no job security, no healthcare, and no stability. We lived paycheck to paycheck. That all changed when my mother and her co-workers organized and formed a union. That union happens to be the CWA.

Unionization brought job and economic security to our family. Our public employee unions are fighting on behalf of millions of people across our country who are serving our communities. They are our teachers, our firefighters, social workers, EMTs, and our police officers. They are us.

These are not normal times. We all need to come together to fight back against an all-out assault on working people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I want to first of all thank Senator HIRONO for introducing one of the most important bills this session. It is all about collective bargaining rights. It is all about workers' voices being heard and all about the dignity of work.

Just last week I was with Senator HIRONO with a number of her constituents from her State, and they talked about her support for manufacturing or especially her support for workers. I was particularly pleased when she mentioned the Communications Workers of America. I have staff with me on the floor—some of my Ohio staff, including my State director, who came out of the CWA. I know how important workers' rights are. So I thank Senator HIRONO for introducing this bill. If we did nothing this session but pass that legislation, it would be a huge victory for workers.

Unfortunately, we have a Supreme Court that puts its thumb on the scales of justice in every case, choosing corporations over workers, choosing Wall Street over consumers, choosing, in far too many cases, health insurance companies over sick people. And today's Supreme Court case is aimed and targeted directly at States like mine, Ohio, a State that is a swing State and has 12 Republican House Members, 4 Democratic House Members and has had that same configuration of 12 and 4 for 4 State elections because of redistricting. But it is no surprise, with the Supreme Court deciding that they were



going to put their thumb on the scale of justice again, against voting rights, against civil rights. That is what has happened in support of corporate money.

So dark money has affected the special-interest Supreme Court. We have never seen a Supreme Court in my lifetime that is beholden to corporate interests, that is beholden to billionaire contributors, that is beholden to special interests. We have never seen a Court like this.

What does this mean? It means that instead of citizens choosing their elected officials, it is politicians choosing whom they represent. That is why you get these districts that will stay 12-to-4 Republican, where voters have no real say in these elections because of the way it is lined up.

We have a Supreme Court that is hostile to voting rights, hostile to worker rights, hostile to women's rights, hostile to LGBTQ rights. That is what this Supreme Court has given us, as Senator MCCONNELL, in his office down the hall, continues to push judges like this who don't look toward the public interest. They are always looking toward rewarding their billionaire contributors.

Again, I thank Senator HIRONO for her work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—  
S. 386

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, an important and bipartisan piece of legislation on which I have been a proud sponsor and on which I have been proud to work with Senator HARRIS to bring this bill to fruition.

It has been many years in the making, and I am pleased to stand behind this legislation and to push it forward. There is no question that immigration is one of the most important and also politically fraught and politically charged issues in front of Congress right now. More often than not, we can't even seem to agree on what the problems in our immigration system are, let alone come to an agreement about how best to solve them.

That makes it all the more important for us at least to come together to get something done in those areas where we can find common ground and do so across party lines on issues that are neither Republican or Democratic, neither liberal or conservative, but that are simply American issues that are central to who we are.

We are great as a country not because of who we are but because of what we do, because of the fact that we choose freedom, we choose to be welcoming, and we choose to be that shining city on the hill, where anyone can come into this country, be born or immigrate into this country as a poor

person, and hope and have the reasonable expectation that one day, if they work hard and play by the rules, they might have the opportunity to retire comfortably, in some cases wealthy.

We have to find common ground in these areas. The Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act is an important point of common ground.

Employment-based immigration visas—the one significant area of our immigration system based on skills and based on merit—are currently issued in accordance with rigid, arbitrary, antiquated, and outdated per-country quotas. This means that in a given year, immigrants from any one given country cannot, in most cases, be given more than 7 percent of the total number of visas allocated. As a result of this, immigrants from nations with large populations have significantly longer wait times to get a green card than do immigrants from smaller countries. In some cases, they could be stuck in a backlog of green card petitions for decades.

This makes no sense. This is arbitrary. It is capricious. It is unfair. It is un-American. It is not what we do. This is one of the many features of our Buddy Holly/Elvis Presley-era immigration code that are outdated and that need to be cast into the dustbin of history. These per-country visa caps cause serious problems for good people, for American businesses and American workers alike, and they cause unfair, undue, and immense hardship for the immigrants who happen to be unfortunate enough to be stuck in that very backlog.

While employment-based green cards are supposed to go to immigrants with high skills who will help grow the American economy, the per-country caps distort this system by causing some immigrants to wait years before receiving a green card for a reason that may be totally unrelated and generally is completely detached from their qualifications. This undermines our ability to bring the best and the brightest individuals to our country. It is to our harm, and it is to our own shame.

Further, the per-country caps force the immigrants that are stuck in this backlog—95 percent of whom are already inside the United States—to make the difficult choice between, on the one hand, staying in America and waiting decades for a green card, or on the other hand, leaving and taking their talents to a country that provides a fairer process for allocating legal immigrant status as a worker.

Worse still, because individuals in the green card backlog can only sponsor temporary visas for their children while these children are younger than 21, the per-country caps force families to choose between separating and sending their children back to their country of origin as they age out of their visas while their parents keep waiting in the United States for their own opportunity to receive a green card or

giving up entirely on their dreams of becoming lawful permanent residents within the United States of America. In many cases, these are children who legally immigrated with their parents and did so at an early age and who have come to call America their home, adopting our customs, our language, our ways of life, having been educated here and socialized here.

Because immigrants in the backlog are also severely limited in their ability to change jobs, the per-country caps often force them to work under conditions that other employees would justifiably and understandably find completely unacceptable. This exposes these immigrants to harassment, exploitation, and abuse, without any option of switching employers. What is more, because these employees can't switch jobs, they have less power to negotiate fair salaries, which depresses wages not only for these immigrant workers themselves but also for their colleagues, whether or not they are American citizens.

Fortunately, the solution to these problems is not only straightforward but agreed upon by a broad, bipartisan coalition of lawmakers. We must eliminate the per-country caps to ensure a fair and reasonable allocation of employment-based green cards. That is exactly what the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act would accomplish, and that is exactly what this bill is all about.

Without the per-country caps, our skills-based green card system would operate on a first-come, first-serve basis, ensuring that immigrants are admitted into the United States purely based on merit rather than on the arbitrary, outdated, unreasonable basis of their country of origin. This, after all, is what the American dream has often been about. It is about who we are as a people rather than where our parents came from, who they were, what they looked like, and what language they might have spoken.

This reform would also ensure that the hardships caused by decades-long wait times would be eliminated.

Importantly, the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act also contains critical safeguards to ensure that the transition from the per-country cap system to a first-come, first-served system would occur smoothly and without unduly disrupting existing immigration flows. Specifically, this bill includes a 3-year set-aside of green cards for immigrants who are not in the backlog to ensure that they can continue to enter the country as we process backlog petitions.

In addition, the bill contains an important "do no harm" provision to make certain that green card applicants who are at the front of the line now will stay at the front of the line and not be faced with new delays as we work through the backlog during this transition process. These provisions will ensure that we are truly treating all immigrants in the employment-based system fairly.

For many years, this critical legislation was stalled because of the concerns of some Members that any reform to the employment-based visa system should be accompanied by new protections against fraud and abuse in the H-1B program. To address those concerns this Congress, I negotiated an amendment to the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act with Senator GRASSLEY to include new protections for American workers in how we process applications for H-1B visas.

This amendment negotiated with Senator GRASSLEY does three things: First, the Grassley amendment would strengthen the Department of Labor's ability to investigate and enforce labor condition application requirements. In addition, it would reform the labor condition application process to ensure complete and adequate disclosure of information regarding the employer's H-1B hiring practices. Finally, it would close loopholes by which employers could otherwise circumvent the annual cap on H-1B workers.

Importantly, the Grassley amendment—like the underlying bill itself—consists of provisions that have long enjoyed support from Members of this body on both sides of the aisle and from every point along the ideological spectrum. They are drawn from an H-1B reform bill that has been championed both by Senator GRASSLEY and by Senator DURBIN.

I am grateful that Senator GRASSLEY was willing to come to the table and work in good faith on achieving a reasonable compromise on this bill. I believe the deal we have struck is a fair and evenhanded way to address longstanding concerns about our H-1B system while eliminating country-of-origin discrimination in how we allocate skills-based green cards.

The reason the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act enjoys such broad, solemn, deep, and unwavering bipartisan support is because it does not include any of the typical partisan poison pills and other controversial provisions that so often undermine and in many cases doom other immigration reform efforts. This is a narrow, surgical reform—one that is necessary, one that is palatable, and one that is long overdue.

I would like to conclude by thanking Senator HARRIS, who has been an indefatigable partner with me on this bill. I have been proud to work side by side with her to eliminate the country-of-origin discrimination and bring about a system of fairness in how we allocate employment-based green cards.

This is an important and, indeed, essential reform to our immigration laws and one that has been a long time coming.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 386 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the Grassley amendment at

the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object, I have offered a modest compromise amendment to this legislation. I stand ready and open to negotiate and discuss this. We have often discussed it in private and in public. I will object until we can get to negotiating terms, and we can hopefully pass this bill once we enter into a dialogue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I approach with great sadness and disappointment the response just brought about by my distinguished colleague, my friend, the junior Senator from Kentucky. I have a great deal of respect for him. The fact that he and I have worked on so many issues side by side together in order to improve government makes this not easier but makes it more difficult.

The reforms to which my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky, refers are themselves born of a genuine desire to improve our immigration system. But, alas, the reforms he has proposed are not, in my view, compatible with the scope of this bill, nor are they compatible with something that can reasonably pass through this body. That is one of the reasons I have introduced the legislation as I have.

I worked on this nearly the entirety of the 8½ half years I have had the opportunity and great privilege to serve the people of Utah in the Senate. This is by far the closest we have ever come to having a deal, and we achieved that deal by keeping this bill focused on the very things this legislation deals with.

The suggestions that Senator PAUL has made, while born of great concern for our country and a noble degree of commitment to serving the people of his State, are not themselves compatible with the scope of this legislation, nor are they compatible with what would likely be passed by this body.

We have an opportunity right now to pass this. This could pass this body right now. I find it greatly disappointing that my colleague and my friend has chosen not to allow this to pass this body today. This is something that could and should and otherwise would pass this body today without that objection.

I would respectfully but with all the urgency I am capable of communicating implore my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, to reconsider his objection and allow this to pass.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 883 TO S. 1790

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up Udall amendment No. 883.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. UDALL], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 883 to S. 1790, as amended.

Mr. UDALL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as amended, is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit unauthorized military operations in or against Iran)

At the end of subtitle C of title XII of the amendment, add the following:

#### SEC. 1226. PROHIBITION OF UNAUTHORIZED MILITARY OPERATIONS AGAINST IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No funds authorized by this Act may be used to conduct hostilities against the Government of Iran, against the Armed Forces of Iran, or in the territory of Iran.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

(1) to restrict the use of the United States Armed Forces to defend against an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces;

(2) to limit the obligations under the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.); or

(3) to affect the provisions of an Act or a joint resolution of Congress specifically authorizing such hostilities that is enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. UDALL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise to respond to some of the criticisms of the Udall amendment that I believe are misleading and deserve a response.

To start, I want to point out an area of agreement. The opposition says our amendment is simple, and it agrees on its intent—that this amendment would prohibit a war with Iran without there being congressional approval, and that is what the vote is about. The arguments from those in the opposition mislead to avoid that simple truth. They are trying to create excuses for why we should ignore the Constitution and open the door to war with Iran without having a vote. President

Trump has said he was 10 minutes away from doing just that.

Here is some of what we have heard. Critics say we only have one Commander in Chief, not 535, and so we should not pass this amendment.

We agree. We only have one Commander in Chief, but the Commander in Chief executes wars. Only Congress can declare them. Our Founders made that decision for good reason. Dictators and Kings declare war unilaterally. Democracies don't. In our democracy, the people decide whether we go to war or whether we don't go to war through their elected representatives. Congress is the most direct voice of the people.

Once that decision has been made, then it is up to one Commander in Chief to execute that war. The people of New Mexico did not send me here to be a battalion commander or a general, and I have no intention of acting like one. The people of New Mexico sent me here to do my constitutional duty, and article I, section 8 vests the power of declaring war with the Congress.

Critics also falsely say our amendment limits our forces' ability to defend themselves or take incoming fire before they can respond. The majority leader said our amendment defines "self-defense" too narrowly.

I am confused at what he is referring to. Our amendment does not include a separate definition of "self-defense." Our amendment expressly states that it does not restrict "the use of the United States Armed Forces to defend against attack." This language does not, in any way, change the Department of Defense's rules of engagement that guide how to exercise our inherent right of self-defense. The DOD does not require a unit to absorb an attack before it can defend itself, and neither does our amendment.

The only restriction in the amendment is that the President cannot enter into hostilities without having congressional approval. It is a restriction that is embedded in our Constitution. If the Republicans are proposing to do away with that restriction, I agree with my colleague Senator MERKLEY that they must come to the floor and propose a constitutional amendment to do so.

Our forces in Iraq, Bahrain, and other locations in the Middle East are fully capable and empowered to defend themselves, and this amendment does not affect that. Unfortunately, the opposition is just repeating itself, trying to generate a reason to abdicate its own constitutional duty.

We have also heard criticism that this amendment is "appeasing the Ayatollahs" and represents "weakness" and that we must allow the President to launch military action to be tough.

We have heard these kinds of arguments before. They were very common in the run up to the disastrous Iraq war. Do not question the arguments for war. To do so is to be weak.

I could not disagree more.

Our Constitution is our strength, and this amendment simply reaffirms our

Constitution in the face of a President who is threatening to flout it. Our Nation is strong when we are united. We do not need to give up congressional authority over war and peace to one man, the President, in order to be strong.

Congress has authorized military action before, and when majorities believe that the circumstances warrant it, Congress will do so again. If we fear Iran so much that we are willing to walk away from the constitutional requirements to authorize military action, that would be the real sign of weakness.

We have also heard that we cannot rely on Congress to authorize force if we need it to. We heard that Congress can barely name a post office. So how can we trust it with this kind of decision? What if Congress is out of town and cannot vote?

First, it is disappointing to hear Members of the Senate speak so cynically about this body on the floor during a debate as important as this. The Congress does not function perfectly. That is very true. Yet history is clear that Congress has authorized military force many times in the past. I have supported some, and I have opposed others, but we had debates and votes. Only recently has the 2001 authorization been so abused to authorize military action all over the globe—far beyond the al-Qaida and Afghanistan mission that Congress thought it was voting on.

Congress, though, has had these debates and has voted, and those decisions represent our national decisions. I see no reason to turn our back on our Constitution just because Iran is a regional threat and this administration has manufactured a crisis to exacerbate that threat.

If there is a national security crisis that requires Congress to vote on military force, we can all get on a plane and come to Washington and do our jobs. Maybe we will even have a vote on Friday. Congress voted after Pearl Harbor, and Congress voted after 9/11. Both were in the middle of national crises. Our troops will be the ones making real sacrifices. We can bear the cost of some inconvenient recess travel. Our job is to debate and vote on matters of war and peace—period, end of story.

We have also heard that the Department of Defense is opposed to our amendment.

Yesterday, Mr. John Rood, the Under Secretary for Policy at the Department of Defense, sent a letter to the leaders of the Armed Services Committee in its opposition to our amendment. The letter is short, and while it contains speculation and rhetoric, it includes no legal analysis and fails to address the plain language of the amendment or longstanding DOD authority or rules of engagement.

I am disappointed in the letter, but it should not be a surprise from a political appointee from the Trump admin-

istration, not when the President is openly declaring that he needs no authority from Congress to launch a war against Iran. The letter reads that the amendment "purports to limit the President's authority in discharging his responsibility as Commander in Chief," which is simply false.

The amendment straightforwardly affirms the constitutional authority of Congress to authorize military action—authority that the President is openly flouting in his public comments.

If Congress authorizes military action against Iran, the Commander in Chief would be free to execute it.

The letter asserts, without evidence, that our amendment will embolden Iran. I hope we are not so weak that we think our Constitution emboldens Iran.

Overall, the letter cites nothing—the Constitution, no law, no DOD policy, no legal analysis, nothing—in support of its claims.

This letter from DOD, which lacks a confirmed Secretary, is a disappointment, but it should not be read as any authoritative take on this amendment, its intent, or its effect.

Some have said that this amendment would block the United States from helping Israel defend itself from an Iranian attack. I support Israel's right to defend itself, and this argument does not hold up.

First, this amendment has no impact on our ongoing security assistance and cooperation with Israel, including the recent MOU signed with Israel by President Obama.

Second, if Israel is attacked, there is nothing in this amendment that would prohibit the United States from coming to its aid with defensive measures.

Third, if Israel is attacked and the United States wants to send our military to engage in direct hostilities, we are going to need to debate and authorize any response in Congress. That is simply what the Constitution says.

Finally, the biggest risk of Iranian attacks on Israel, according to one Israeli Cabinet Minister last month, is the escalating tension between the United States and Iran.

The best thing we can do to protect Israel is diplomacy to stop a broader regional war in the Middle East. If the United States does go to war with Iran, Israel is likely to face very serious threats, and that is something we should take seriously if we consider the use of force.

Israeli Energy Minister Yuval Steinitz said in May that "things are heating up" in the Persian Gulf.

He said:

If there's some sort of conflagration between Iran and the United States, between Iran and its neighbors, I'm not ruling out that they will activate Hezbollah and Islamic Jihad from Gaza, or even that they will try to fire missiles from Iran at the State of Israel.

So the threats to Israel from Iran only make it more important that we have a full debate and vote on military action, not less important.

Again, the purpose of our amendment is simple: The President is threatening to launch military action against Iran without authorization, publicly flouting Congress. This amendment says that we are not going to go into an unauthorized war with Iran.

If the President and Members of this body think we need to take military action against Iran, then let's have that debate and let's vote.

The Udall amendment ensures we follow the constitutional process. To do otherwise is to be in dereliction of our constitutional duty.

Mr. ROMNEY. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. UDALL. The Senator from New Mexico yields the floor.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the perspective and sincere thoughts and ideas coming from my good friend from New Mexico.

The Senator indicated that those who oppose this are trying to create excuses for why we should ignore the Constitution.

I would note that in my remarks this morning I noted specifically that this is not an authorization to use military force against Iran or anyone else. It is a statement of continued commitment to our national defense, and, precisely, it is saying that under the Constitution only Congress may declare war. That is something I said specifically.

But the Senator goes on to note—he says that only the Congress—specifically, his words are “ignore the Constitution, open the door to war with Iran without a vote.”

President Trump has said he was 10 minutes away from doing just that. Is the Senator saying that if the President were to do what he was contemplating, and that is to take out missile batteries with the potential of the loss of life of as many as 150, but also it could be with a prewarning, with no loss of life, but taking out missile batteries that have fired upon an American aircraft—unmanned American aircraft—if he were to have done that in response to their shooting down an aircraft in international airspace, that constitutes going to war and would have required a vote of Congress to authorize shooting down or attacking missile batteries that have fired rockets at an American airship?

I am referring to the Senator's comments precisely, and I will read the entire point.

The Senator said: “They are trying to create excuses for why we should ignore the Constitution and open the door to war with Iran without a vote.”

President Trump has said that he was 10 minutes away from doing just that. So in the Senator's view, is responding in a very limited manner, as he was contemplating, taking out missile batteries potentially—would that have constituted going to war and required the vote of Congress?

That is my question, because I believe that is not the case. I believe the President has the constitutional au-

thority and duty to respond, if necessary, in an appropriate way to return fire on the very batteries that have shot down an American aircraft.

I yield the floor.

#### TRIBUTE TO BLAIR BRETTSCHEIDER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to tell you about two young women from Chicago and a discovery they made together that has helped to transform the lives of hundreds of other young women.

Domitira Nahishakiye moved with her family from the African nation of Burundi to Chicago in 2007. Three years later, she found herself overwhelmed. At 18, she was attending high school, trying to prepare for college, and caring for her three younger siblings.

The refugee resettlement efforts worked mostly with boys and young men. It didn't offer many programs to help Domi balance the pressures of caring for her siblings and preparing for college. Getting ready for college is tough for almost everyone. Imagine how much harder it is if you have grown up in another culture and you are helping to care for three siblings.

Fortunately, Domi met another young woman named Blair Brettschneider.

Blair grew up in Detroit. After graduating from the University of Miami in Florida, she had hoped to become a journalist, but the Great Recession caused Blair to rethink her career path. She moved to Chicago to work for AmeriCorps VISTA, sometimes called the domestic Peace Corps. Blair was a “gofer” for the refugee resettlement agency.

Not content with coffee runs and other “busy work,” Blair started talking to the families her agency was helping. That is how she met Domi.

Blair started to tutor Domi and help her with her homework at the after-school center, but Domi's home responsibilities made it difficult for her to attend the sessions regularly.

Rather than give up, Blair started tutoring Domi at her home. She helped her master her studies and apply for college. She also helped Domi adapt to life in her new homeland.

Blair realized that Domi was not alone. Many immigrant girls and young women Blair spoke with shared the same needs, and many refugee agencies just weren't set up to help them.

That realization led Blair to establish a foundation in 2011 to provide other young women refugees in Chicagoland with the same types of support that Blair offered Domi. It is called GirlForward. It has since expanded its reach to help young women in Austin, TX, as well. Since 2011, GirlForward has helped nearly 300 refugee women in the Chicago area and in Austin find mentors, friends, support, and encouragement in America.

Amina Imran, a refugee from Pakistan, is one of those fortunate young

women. She used to joke that the only way she could attend college is if she robbed a bank, but after finishing the Chicago GirlForward program in 2017, she now attends North Park University in Chicago, on a scholarship.

GirlForward is routinely cited as one of the best charities in Chicago. Reader's Digest declared GirlForward the Best of America.

My visits to GirlForward in Chicago were some of the happiest moments on my schedule. Young women from every corner of the world found friendship and encouragement with their peers. The processes of assimilating language and culture were lifted as these amazing young women came together and shared their struggles and joys.

In helping young women refugees to thrive in their new home, Blair Brettschneider is following in the footsteps of another great Chicagoan. In 1889, Jane Addams founded Hull House on the Near West Side of Chicago. It was one of America's first settlement houses, where new citizens could acquire domestic and job skills and learn about American Government and customs. For her work with Hull House and other social justice causes, Jane Addams became the first American woman ever to receive the Nobel Peace Prize.

GirlForward is a new version of Hull House.

In July, Blair will be leaving GirlForward. Fortunately, she leaves the GirlForward programs in Chicagoland and in Austin in strong shape.

On behalf of the hundreds of young women whose lives GirlForward has helped enrich and transform and the hundreds of young women who will follow them, I want to thank Blair Brettschneider for her remarkable work and wish her all the best in her new efforts.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss Senate amendment No. 861, offered by our colleague from Utah.

The author of the amendment, Senator ROMNEY, and others have made clear that this language does not constitute an authorization of the use of military force, or AUMF. I agree with that assessment.

While this amendment appears to restate existing Presidential authority to defend the country in the event of an attack, it includes other language that could be interpreted to provide more authority to the President. That concerns me, which is why I voted against this amendment.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, amendment No. 861 fully captures the utter failure of the modern Congress to assert and defend congressional war powers that the U.S. Constitution solely vests in the legislative branch. It treats matters of life and death as mere fodder for political “gotcha”

votes and represents an approach to legislating that is ultimately as simplistic as it is dangerous.

If one asked 10 attorneys to analyze the text of amendment No. 861, one might very well receive 10 wildly different interpretations of what the undefined terms in the amendment mean, from the use of the term “attack by the government, military forces, or proxies of a foreign nation or by other hostile forces” to the phrase “used to ensure the ability of the Armed Forces of the United States to defend themselves, and United States citizens.”

As the authors plausibly argue, the intent of the amendment may very well be to simply reaffirm existing legal interpretations and norms that authorize the U.S. Armed Forces to defend itself and our citizens against attack by a foreign nation or other hostile force. As supporters argue, the amendment language avoids using the specific phrase “authorization for use of military force,” and thus one may argue that it is technically not an “AUMF.”

Yet adopting such an interpretation requires ignoring years of executive branch overreach when it comes to taking unilateral military action without seeking an authorization for use of military force or a declaration of war from Congress.

It requires willfully forgetting the behavior of our current President and past Presidents of both parties, who have chosen to define the concept of Commander in Chief under Article II of the U.S. Constitution to be less a commander and more an emperor while the legislative branch has sat idly by as its war powers were rapidly seized by the modern imperial Presidency.

Congress is a coequal branch of government. It is time we started acting like it. We cannot trust any President to take a blank check and fill in a reasonable number. I must oppose amendment 861 because, in my reading, any President of any party would adopt the broadest legal interpretation possible in defining what constitutes an “other hostile force” or an “attack” or what it means to “ensure the ability of the Armed Forces of the U.S. to defend themselves.”

This language risks unintentionally authorizing President Trump to order all types of military strikes against any number of potential entities that the President deems to be a threat. How would the Trump administration determine the precise baseline that defines the term “ability” of the military to defend itself? Would allowing the degradation of any platform or capability qualify as failing to “ensure the ability” of the U.S. Armed Forces to defend itself? If so, that would authorize the use of funds in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 to take unilateral, preemptive action again a foreign nation or hostile force to preserve the current capabilities of the U.S. military.

I am confident the author of this amendment would disagree with this

interpretation of his legislative language. However, would the sponsor argue that such an interpretation is unreasonable or not possible? Would a Federal Court not defer to the Federal Agency’s interpretation of a vague and ambiguous statute? I do not know the answer to either question; yet I know this: I am not willing to take that risk.

We are living with the consequences of a previous Congress that rushed to pass a concise authorization for use of military force that appeared targeted and limited at first. We have watched as Republican and Democratic administrations alike subsequently employed creative and broad legal interpretations of that authorization to continually expand which parties were connected with the horrific terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

To this very day, the Trump administration cites this authorization for use of military force as legal justification to unilaterally deploy Americans all around the world, even though it was authorized in response to an event that took place before some of these troops were even born. To be clear, I am not asserting that I oppose the premise or substantive motivation of every military action that has taken place under the recent Presidential administrations. I am simply stating that such actions must be debated and voted on by Congress.

I deployed to fight in a war I personally opposed because it was ordered by the Commander in Chief, and these orders were pursuant to an authorization for use of military force that was publicly debated and passed by a majority of our Nation’s elected representatives. Opposing a vaguely worded amendment whose own author and proponents assert is duplicative and unnecessary and which I believe may unintentionally open the door to unlimited unilateral military action, ultimately is a vote to make our Nation stronger, more accountable, and a more perfect union in living out the principles contained in our founding document.

Critics may falsely allege that opposing amendment No. 861 is voting against our national defense and military. I will strongly reject any such ridiculous claim that slanders me with the accusation that I would ever risk the security and safety of the Nation I have proudly served in uniform. In voting against amendment No. 861, I am safeguarding our military from excessive use without congressional oversight. I am simply making clear that we, in Congress, must begin exercising the same care and attention in doing our job as our troops do when executing their missions downrange.

One of my primary motivations for serving the great State of Illinois in the U.S. Senate is to help restore congressional war powers. To remind my colleagues that whether one favors military action or opposes the use of military force, every Member of Congress should agree that such matters deserve to be debated and carefully

considered by our Nation’s duly elected representatives in the broad light of day. To remind my colleagues that we must always demand the Commander in Chief clearly outline our desired strategic end state before authorizing military action that puts our troops in harm’s way.

The bottom line is that only Congress has the power to declare war. We are the ones tasked with deciding when and how we send Americans into combat. We are the ones the Constitution charged with that most solemn duty.

For too long, too many elected officials have avoided the responsibility and burden of declaring war. Fearing electoral risks and staring down coming elections, multiple Congresses have shirked their constitutional responsibility to our troops by refusing to repeal the existing authorization for use of military force, while avoiding consideration any new authorizations for use of military force. Enough—enough of being so worried about political consequences that we fail to do our own jobs, even as we expect our troops to do theirs without complaint every day.

We need to do better by our servicemembers. We owe it to them to honor their sacrifices. Part of that means ensuring that no American sheds blood in a war Congress has not authorized, or unintentionally authorized by passing vague language such as in amendment No. 861 that can be twisted to be read as empowering President Trump to take preemptive military action.

We should be disciplined in forcing any President who wishes to go to war to bring their case to Congress and give the American people a vote through their elected representatives. That is how we truly respect our servicemembers and military families: by demanding debate that is honest and clear-eyed about the likely loss of life and the risks of escalation that accompany any use of force. It is our duty, and it is the least we can do for those willing to risk their lives in safeguarding our democracy, our way of life, and our Constitution.

So with the drums of war beating louder and louder by the day, I must oppose amendment No. 861 and keep my promise to all who served or are serving now in defense of this country we love. I must continue seeking to hold all of us who have the honor of serving in Congress accountable for taking back congressional war powers. Moving forward, I urge the leadership of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees to work with me to strike or significantly restrict this language during the conference negotiations that will take place over the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020.

#### LOWER HEALTH CARE COSTS ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my opening statement at the Senate

Health Education, Labor and Pensions Committee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### LOWER HEALTH CARE COSTS ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Today we are voting on three bills:

First, the Poison Center Network Enhancement Act, offered by Senators Murray and Burr, to reauthorize and update the national network of poison control centers.

Second, the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program Reauthorization Act, offered by Senator Casey and me, to ensure that, from the ambulance to the emergency room, emergency health care providers are fully prepared to treat children, who typically require smaller equipment and different doses of medicine.

Third, the Lower Health Care Costs Act—a package of 54 proposals from 65 senators—29 Republican and 36 Democrat, including nearly every member of this Committee—that will reduce what Americans pay out of their own pockets for health care.

The Lower Health Care Costs Act will reduce what Americans pay out of their pockets for health care in three major ways: First, it ends surprise billing. Second, it creates more transparency—there are twelve bipartisan provisions that will: eliminate gag clauses and anti-competitive terms in insurance contracts, designate a non-profit entity to unlock insurance claims for employers, ban Pharmacy Benefit Managers (PBM) from charging more for a drug than the PBM paid for the drug, and require that patients receive more information on the cost and quality of their health care. You can't lower your health care costs until you know what your health care actually costs. And third, it increases prescription drug competition—there are fourteen bipartisan provisions to help more lower-cost generic and biosimilar drugs reach patients.

This legislation also extends mandatory funding for community health centers, and four additional public health programs, to ensure the 27 million Americans who rely on these centers for primary care and other health care can continue to access care close to home, offered by Senator Murray and me, along with Senators Casey, Cramer, Klobuchar, and Murkowski.

We have paid for this extension for five years with savings from other parts of the larger bill, which will prevent the uncertainty and anxiety of short-term extensions.

The Managers Amendment we are voting on today includes two additional, significant provisions: First, a bill from Senators McConnell and Kaine that will raise the minimum age for purchasing any tobacco product from 18 to 21. This has also been a priority of Senators Young, Romney, Roberts, Murkowski, Collins, Schatz, and others.

And two, from Senators Grassley and Leahy, and many others, the CREATES Act, which will help bring more lower cost generic drugs to patients by eliminating anti-competitive practices by brand drug makers.

Altogether, this legislation will help to lower the cost of health care, which has become a tax on family budgets and on businesses, on federal and state governments.

A recent Gallup poll found that the cost of health care was the biggest financial problem facing American families. And last July, this Committee heard from Dr. Brent James, from the National Academies, who testified that up to half of what the American people spend on health care may be unnecessary.

Over the last two years, this Committee has held 16 hearings on a wide range of topics related to reducing the cost of health care—specifically, how do we reduce what the

American people pay out of their own pockets for health care.

Last December, I sent a letter to experts at the American Enterprise Institute and the Brookings Institution, and to doctors, economists, governors, insurers, employers, and other health care innovators, asking for specific steps Congress could take to lower the cost of health care.

We received over 400 recommendations, some as many as 50 pages long. In May, Senator Murray and I released for discussion the Lower Health Care Costs Act. Since then, we've received over 400 additional comments on our draft legislation, and last Tuesday, we held a hearing to hear additional feedback.

Last Wednesday, Senator Murray and I formally introduced the Lower Health Care Costs Act—a bipartisan package of 54 proposals from 65 senators that will reduce what Americans pay out of their own pockets for health care.

At our hearing on this legislation last week, Ben Ippolito, an economics and health fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, said: "Together, the provisions in this bill would meaningfully increase competition and transparency in health care markets. If enacted, this legislation would lower insurance premiums and drug prices for consumers, and would ensure patients are no longer exposed to surprise medical bills. By lowering costs, this bill would also improve access to health care."

We also heard from Fredrick Isasi, Executive Director of Families USA, at our hearing, who said: "The Reducing Lower Health Care Costs Act is an ambitious piece of legislation—particularly so as a bipartisan bill in these most contentious of times."

And Avik Roy recently wrote in Forbes: "Overall, its provisions could be thought of as incremental in scope. But some—especially those around transparency—could have a significant impact."

Here are a few of the ways this legislation will lower health care costs:

Ensures that patients do not receive a surprise medical bill—which is when you unexpectedly receive a \$300 bill, or even a \$3,000 bill, two months after our surgery, because one of your doctors was outside of your insurance network.

Senators Cassidy, Hassan, and Murkowski have done valuable work to solve surprise medical billing by proposing a solution last fall and again this spring, and lighting a fire under Congress to end this harmful practice.

I thank them for their dedication to this issue, and for working with Senator Murray and me to reach a result that protects patients.

Senator Murray and I have agreed on a recommendation to our colleagues that the best solution to protect patients from surprise medical bills is to pay doctors and hospitals that are out-of-network the median contracted rate that in-network doctors and hospitals receive for the same services in their local geographic area, known as the benchmark solution.

This is a change for me because I was inclined to support an in-network guarantee since I believe it is the simplest solution.

Some of my colleagues are inclined to support a new independent system of dispute resolution, known as arbitration. The Congressional Budget Office has indicated that the benchmark solution is the most effective at lowering health care costs and Chairman Pallone and Ranking Member Walden have recommended this proposal to the House of Representatives.

We have also extended this protection to air ambulances, because according to the Government Accountability Office, nearly 70 percent of air ambulance transports were

out-of-network in 2017 and the median price charged by air ambulance providers was about \$36,400 for a helicopter transport and \$40,600 for a fixed-wing transport.

It is time to stop studying the issue of exorbitant air ambulance charges and take action.

Our legislation will treat air ambulances the same as health care providers—by using the local, commercial market-based rate for in-network health care.

This legislation will bring more generic and biosimilar drugs to market faster and lower the cost of prescription drugs by: Helping biosimilar companies speed drug development through a transparent, modernized, and searchable patent database. Senators Collins, Kaine, Braun, Hawley, Murkowski, Paul, Portman, Shaheen, and Stabenow worked on this provision.

Improves the Food and Drug Administration's drug patent database by keeping it more up to date—to help generic drug companies speed product development, a proposal offered by Senators Cassidy and Durbin.

Prevents the abuse of citizens' petitions that can unnecessarily delay drug approvals, from Senators Gardner, Shaheen, Cassidy, Bennet, Cramer, and Braun.

Clarifies that the makers of brand biological products, such as insulin, are not gaming the system to delay new, lower cost biosimilars from coming to market, from Senators Smith, Cassidy, and Cramer; and Eliminates a loophole that allows drug companies to get exclusivity—and delay less costly alternatives from coming to market—just by making small tweaks to an old drug, a proposal from Senators Roberts, Cassidy, and Smith.

Modernizes outdated labeling of certain generic drugs, offered by Senators Bennet and Enzi.

This legislation creates more transparency by:

Banning gag clauses that prevent employers and patients from knowing the true price and quality of health care services. This proposal from Senators Cassidy and Bennet would allow an employer to know that a knee replacement might cost \$15,000 in one hospital and \$35,000 at another hospital;

Requiring health care facilities to provide a summary of services when a patient is discharged from a hospital to make it easier to track bills, and requires hospitals to send all bills within 45 calendar days to protect patients from receiving unexpected bills many months after care, a provision worked on by Senators Enzi and Casey; and

Requiring doctors and insurers to provide patients with price quotes on their expected out-of-pocket costs for care, so patients are able to shop around, a proposal from Senators Cassidy, Young, Murkowski, Ernst, Kennedy, Sullivan, Cramer, Braun, Hassan, Carper, Bennet, Brown, Cardin, Casey, Whitehouse, and Rosen.

It will support state and local efforts to increase vaccination rates, and will help prevent disease outbreaks, through two proposals worked on by Senators Roberts, Peters, and Duckworth.

There is a provision to help communities prevent and reduce obesity, offered by Senators Scott and Jones.

A provision from Senators Schatz, Capito, Cassidy, Collins, Heinrich, Hyde-Smith, Kaine, King, Murkowski, and Udall will expand the use of technology-based health care models to help patients in rural and underserved areas access specialized health care.

And there is a proposal to improve access to mental health care led by Senators Cassidy and Murphy, building on their work in the HELP Committee that became law as part of the response to the opioid crisis.

There are other proposals:

For example, banning anti-competitive terms in health insurance contracts that prevent patients from seeing other, lower-cost, higher-quality providers. The Wall Street Journal identified dozens of cases where anti-competitive terms in contracts between health insurers and hospital systems increase premiums and reduce patient choice.

Banning Pharmacy Benefit Managers, or PBMs, from charging employers, health insurance plans, and patients more for a drug than the PBM paid to acquire the drug, which is known as “spread pricing.”

Eliminating a loophole allowing the first generic drug to submit an application to the FDA and block other generic drugs from being approved.

Provisions to improve care for expectant and new moms and their babies.

Provisions to make it as easy to get your personal medical records as it is to book an airplane flight.

And provisions to incentivize health care organizations to use the best cybersecurity practices to protect your privacy and health information.

I hope we will today vote to approve this legislative package so we can present it to Majority Leader McConnell and Minority Leader Schumer for the full Senate to consider next month and would expect that other committees will have their own contributions.

Since January, Senator Murray and I have been working in parallel with Senator Grassley and Senator Wyden, who lead the Finance Committee.

They are working on their own bipartisan bill, which they plan to markup this summer. The Senate Judiciary Committee is marking up bipartisan legislation on prescription drug costs tomorrow. And in the House, the Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Judiciary Committees have all reported out bipartisan bills to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

Secretary Azar and the Department of Health and Human Services have been extremely helpful in reviewing and providing technical advice on the various proposals to reduce health care costs.

And the president has called for ending surprise billing and reducing the cost of prescription drugs. The Administration has also taken steps to increase transparency so families and employers can better understand their health care costs. The Lower Health Care Costs Act is just one example of this Committee reaching a result on a difficult issue.

We did that with fixing No Child Left Behind, with the 21st Century Cures Act, with user fee funding for the Food and Drug Administration, and most recently, with our response to the opioid crisis that included input from 72 senators of both political parties.

We reached those results in the midst of the argument Congress has been locked in for the last decade about where six percent of Americans get their health insurance.

Especially for Americans without subsidies, the cost of health insurance remains way too expensive. But the reality is we will never have lower cost health insurance until we have lower cost health care.

That is why I am especially glad that 65 Senators, including nearly every member of this Committee, have worked together on the Lower Health Care Costs Act which takes needed steps to actually bring down the cost of health care that Americans pay for out of their own pockets.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

### TRIBUTE TO TRENT CLARK

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator JAMES RISCH, Representative MIKE SIMPSON, and Representative RUSS FULCHER, I congratulate Trent Clark on his upcoming retirement from the Bayer Corporation after 26 years of service. We have greatly enjoyed working with Trent over the course of his career and thank him for the service he has provided to the people of Idaho in both his official and individual capacities.

On behalf of Bayer, Trent has provided steadfast dedication to his responsibilities inherent as public and government affairs director. In that role, he has provided invaluable assistance to Bayer’s operations in Soda Springs, which are an integral part of the southeastern Idaho economy. Most notably, Trent has played a critical role in the effort to permit Bayer’s next phosphate mine, Caldwell Canyon, which has 40 years of estimated reserves and will be one of the world’s most environmentally sustainable mining operations, particularly in its approach to sage grouse habitat. Trent has also helped to further important company efforts to support our local communities, particularly their school systems, and to protect our environment. Additionally, for many years, Trent has worked in a collaborative manner with key stakeholders with a genuine humility and desire to achieve a positive outcome.

As an individual citizen, Trent has also provided excellent service to the people of Idaho in his capacity as chairman of the Idaho Workforce Development Council and as a member of the boards of the Idaho Humanities Council, Idaho Community Foundation, and the Idaho Association of Commerce and Industry. Trent’s prior public service includes 2 years as the State executive director of the Farm Services Administration, 3 years as chairman of the Idaho Republican Party, a year as staff to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, and 8 years as staff to former U.S. Senator Steve D. Symms.

Prior to joining Bayer, Trent graduated with honors from Brigham Young University, where he majored in political science and botany. He also earned an associate of arts degree from Ricks College in Rexburg, ID. After college, Trent worked as a botany instructor for the Yellowstone Institute, as well as executive vice president for the Fox Creek Pack Station.

In addition to Trent’s strong record of leadership and service to the community, Trent has served his family and church well. Trent has been married to the former Rebecca Lee since May 23, 1986, and together, they have four children: Brittany (deceased), Kathleen, Christin, and Alexander. Trent and his family enjoy horseback riding and backcountry hiking and

camping. It is our sincere wish that Trent be blessed with many years of retirement with his family. ●

### TRIBUTE TO TROY WITT

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing Troy Witt, of Garfield County, for his selfless actions in helping those in need.

Troy, a rancher and commercial trucker of Sand Springs, spearheaded an effort to send much needed donations to farmers and ranchers impacted by record flooding in Columbus, NE, in March of 2019. He was inspired by Montanans who came to his aid following the Lodgepole Complex fire, Montana’s largest fire of the 2017 wildfire season. After losing 85 percent of his ranch, Witt was overwhelmed by the outpouring of support and supplies he received from those he had never met.

When the opportunity presented itself, Witt decided to pay it forward. He planned to load up his 53-foot trailer with as much hay, fencing material, water and other supplies as he could and drive the 700 miles to the drop-off site in Columbus. After the Garfield County Disaster and Emergency Services echoed Witt’s plans, farmers from around Montana offered to donate supplies. His efforts helped bring hope to a region where hundreds had lost homes and businesses.

Witt’s act exemplifies the spirit of compassion and selflessness that Montanans embody. I and many others thank Mr. Witt for his good deed. ●

### TRIBUTE TO CLYDE TERRY

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, today I wish to salute Clyde Terry for his many years of dedicated service and staunch advocacy on behalf of people with disabilities. Clyde is retiring from his longtime role as CEO of Granite State Independent Living, and he leaves a legacy worthy of our praise and our gratitude.

Granite State Independent Living—GSIL—is a nonprofit that breaks down barriers for seniors and people with disabilities and expands the training and support services available to them. Its mission is grounded in a firm belief that all people have a right to define their own level of independence. Under Clyde’s leadership, GSIL has blossomed into an essential statewide organization with a \$17 million budget and several awards and accolades to its name, including Non-Profit of the Year Awards from Business NH Magazine, NH Business Review, and the Greater Concord Chamber of Commerce. Service offerings have grown as well to meet the aging, education, and employment challenges faced by so many across the Granite State.

Clyde has tapped into a wealth of experience to build GSIL into an expansive and responsive organization that remains committed to its founding principles of personal choice and direction. Before his tenure at GSIL, he was

the executive director of the New Hampshire Developmental Disabilities Council, a State agency tasked with protecting the rights of our State's most vulnerable citizens. While affiliated with the council, he coauthored a report on the accessibility of polling locations in the United States and established himself as a national expert on election reform. He was also an administrative hearings officer in the State's service systems, and before that, he helped to create and implement New Hampshire's Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. Throughout his career, Clyde has shown an unrivaled passion for improving the lives of the disabled, the aged, and the impoverished.

I was honored to recommend Clyde when a vacancy arose on the National Council on Disability in 2009. As a member of the council, he became a sought-after voice on the potential of autonomous vehicles to broaden a sense of independence among people with disabilities. He was also a force in fighting for fair pay and equal treatment in the workplace. Clyde was eventually named chairperson of the council, a testament to his leadership and communication skills and his fluency on the broad set of issues in the disability community.

I have known Clyde for decades. We worked together on Gary Hart's 1984 Presidential race. Though the campaign eventually ended in heartbreak, Clyde emerged from the race having met Susan, who would become his beloved wife of many years. As Governor of New Hampshire and U.S. Senator, I always appreciated Clyde's guidance and counsel.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in thanking Clyde Terry for his years of service and advocacy and wishing him all the best in the years ahead.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3351. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 51312(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Mr. King of New York.

At 6:01 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:06 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT) has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3401. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. MCCONNELL).

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3351. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1783. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ethiprole; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9984-41-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1784. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fluopyram; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9994-36-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1785. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mefentrifluconazole; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9994-51-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1786. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of four (4) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1787. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Availability to the Public of Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA) Instructions and Changes Thereto" (RIN0790-AK55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1788. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "General Procedures and Delegations of the Board of Regents, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences"

(RIN0790-AK37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1789. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Public Meeting Procedures of the Board of Regents, Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences" (RIN0790-AK36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1790. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 105th Annual Report of the Federal Reserve Board covering operations for calendar year 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1791. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of Entities to the Entity List and Revision of an Entry on the Entity List" (RIN0694-AH83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1792. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of Entities to the Entity List" (RIN0694-AH86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1793. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Capital, Margin, and Segregation Requirements for Security-Based Swap Dealers and Major Security-Based Swap Participants and Capital Requirements for Broker-Dealers" (RIN3235-AL12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1794. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1795. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the navigation improvements at San Juan Harbor, Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1796. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approvals; California, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9994-19-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1797. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approvals; California, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9994-20-Region 9) received in



the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1798. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; SO2 Emission Limitations for United States Steel-Gary Works" (FRL No. 9995-67-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1799. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; KY; Attainment Plan for Jefferson County SO2 Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 9995-59-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1800. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; Minor New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Program Revisions" (FRL No. 9995-44-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1801. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Oklahoma; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report" (FRL No. 9995-36-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1802. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Change of Address for Region 1 Reports; Technical Correction" (FRL No. 9995-50-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1803. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Repeal of the Clean Power Plan; Emission Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Existing Electric Utility Generating Units; Revisions to Emission Guideline Implementing Regulations" (FRL No. 9995-70-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1804. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical corrections to Maine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA) regulations and disposal sites designated under the MPRSA" (FRL No. 9995-28-OW) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1805. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OSS-2019-0731); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1806. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Depart-

ment of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to the United Kingdom to support the maintenance, repair, and overhaul of the F135 propulsion system powering the F-35 Lightning II aircraft in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-108); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1807. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Parts 4022 and 4044) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1808. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removing the Outdated Regulations Regarding the National Hansen's Disease Program" (RIN0906-AB20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1809. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removing the Outdated Regulations Regarding the Health Education Assistance Loan (HEAL) Program" (RIN0906-AB21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1810. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1811. A communication from the Regulation Policy Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "VA Acquisition Regulation: Special Contracting Methods" (RIN2900-AQ19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1812. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Standard for Stationary Activity Centers" (16 CFR Parts 1112 and 1238) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1813. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard, MY 2018 High-Theft Light-Duty Truck and Exempted Vehicle Line Listing" (RIN2127-AL79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1814. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory

Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Revised 2017 Fishing Restrictions for Tropical Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean" (RIN0648-BH12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1815. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2018 and 2019 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish" (RIN0648-XF633) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1816. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Allow the Use of Longline Pot Gear in the Gulf of Alaska Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota Fishery; Amendment 101" (RIN0648-BF42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-97. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana urging the United States Congress to pass a federal country-of-origin labeling (COOL) law for beef and pork products that meets World Trade Organization requirements; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 16

Whereas, in 2002, Congress reauthorized the Farm Bill, which included mandatory country-of-origin labeling for beef, lamb, pork, farm-raised and wild fish, peanuts, and other perishable commodities; and

Whereas, in 2005, the Montana Legislature passed the Country of Origin Placarding Act until "funding and full implementation of federal mandatory country of origin labeling"; and

Whereas, in 2009, Montana's country-of-origin labeling (COOL) laws were voided, as the federal act was implemented; and

Whereas, in 2015, federal COOL rules ceased being enforced for beef and pork products only due mainly to a World Trade Organization ruling; and

Whereas, consumers want to know the origin of their food; and

Whereas, American and Montana farmers and ranchers want consumers to know the origin of their food; and

Whereas, Congress should pass laws and the U.S. Department of Agriculture should administer rules and regulations for COOL certification for beef and pork products that do not impose undue compliance costs, liability, recordkeeping, or verification requirements on farmers and ranchers.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the 66th Montana Legislature urges Congress to pass a federal COOL law

for beef and pork products that meets World Trade Organization requirements; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the individual members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

POM-98. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana memorializing its opposition to the bison grazing proposal by the American Prairie Reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 28

Whereas, the American Prairie Reserve (APR) controls private properties tied to 18 Bureau of Land Management (BLM) grazing allotments in Fergus, Petroleum, Phillips, and Valley counties; and

Whereas, the APR has requested that the SLM fundamentally shift long-established grazing practices on the 18 BLM allotments, which encompass 250,000 acres of public property; and

Whereas, APR has petitioned to change the allotments from seasonal or rotational grazing to year-round grazing and remove the interior fencing on those allotments; and

Whereas, the APR proposes to allow the year-round, continuous grazing of public land by bison, which would impact the future grazing viability of the allotments; and

Whereas, the existing BLM designation for managed grazing is what science dictates the rangeland can support; and

Whereas, it is the responsibility of the BLM to ensure the future vitality of these public parcels is protected; and

Whereas, the removal of interior fences will eliminate the ability of BLM to control the access of bison to certain parcels to shorten grazing permits in response to drought or fire to protect the rangeland.

*Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:*

(1) That it is essential for the preservation of the future viability of Montana's rangeland that the BLM deny the petition by the APR to alter grazing permits on the 18 allotments under the control of APR.

(2) That the denial of the proposed APR grazing permit change is critical for the health of Montana's livestock and wildlife.

(3) That private landowners and communities should not bear the cost of damages incurred by the lack of integrated bison management in the APR's grazing proposal.

(4) That the denial of the APR grazing proposal would protect Montana farmers, ranchers, and communities.

(5) That the BLM should deny the APR bison grazing proposal.

(6) That the Secretary of State send a copy of this resolution to the United States Congress, the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of Land Management.

POM-99. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana memorializing its support of the ratification of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement; to the Committee on Finance.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 13

Whereas, the United States and Canada have one of the largest trading relationships in the world, and Canada is the United States' largest export market, valued at \$320 billion (\$411 billion Canadian) in goods and services in 2017 and the United States is Canada's largest export market, valued at \$308 billion (\$396 billion Canadian) in 2017 goods and services; and

Whereas, this trade supports 9 million jobs in the United States and 2.1 million jobs in Canada; and

Whereas, in the more than 20 years since the United States, Canada, and Mexico entered into the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), trade among these countries tripled from \$340 billion in 1993 to \$1.2 trillion in 2016; and

Whereas, North American integration of trade under NAFTA has helped to make the region more competitive in the world economy by providing highly integrated and valuable supply chains, as well as common rules and harmonized regulations that increase the speed and global competitiveness of one another's businesses, and by driving investment and imbedding value in each others' economic success, including by providing jobs in North American communities; and

Whereas, Canada and Mexico are the first-ranked and third-ranked markets, respectively, for agriculture exports from the United States at an estimated \$20.6 billion sent to Canada and \$18.6 billion sent to Mexico, up from \$8.7 billion in 1992, the year that NAFTA was signed; and

Whereas, of particular interest to Montana because Canada is its largest trade partner, Canada has agreed to grade imports of wheat from the United States in a manner no less favorable than that accorded to wheat in its own country and not to require a country of origin statement on its quality grade or inspection certificate; and

Whereas, in signing the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, the three countries have agreed to make targeted improvements to NAFTA and build on the successful partnership and a shared competitiveness in the global marketplace in which free, fair, open, and mutually beneficial trade helps to strengthen the economies of all countries.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

That the Montana Legislature supports the ratification of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement on trade by all countries as soon as possible; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Montana Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Consulate of Canada in Colorado, the Consulate of Mexico in Colorado, each member of the United States Senate Finance Committee, the United States House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee, the United States Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations, and the United States House of Representatives Advisory Group on Negotiations, the United States Trade Representative, the United States Secretary of Commerce, the United States Secretary of State, the United States Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator.

POM-100. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to the naturalization procedures of non-American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 580. A bill to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-53).

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

\*Mark Lee Greenblatt, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of the Interior.

\*Daniel Habib Jorjani, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Peter Joseph Phipps, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Charles R. Eskridge III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

William Shaw Stickman IV, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Jennifer Philpott Wilson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Wilmer Ocasio, of Puerto Rico, to be United States Marshal for the District of Puerto Rico for the term of four years.

\*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1999. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide transitional coverage and retroactive Medicare part D coverage for certain low-income beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2000. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove an institutional bias by making permanent the protection for recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 2001. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O'Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 2002. A bill to require that any debt limit increase or suspension be balanced by equal spending cuts over the next decade; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2003. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to designate a 3-digit dialing code for veterans in crisis; to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2004. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish insulin assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 2005. A bill to establish the IMPACT for Energy Foundation; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2006. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain conduct relating to the use of horses for human consumption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2007. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from implementing a proposed rule regarding requirements under Community Planning and Development housing programs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2008. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GARDNER, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2009. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the establishment of a small business voucher program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2010. A bill to increase research, education, and treatment for cerebral cavernous malformations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2011. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce the credit hour requirement for the Edith Nourse Rogers STEM Scholarship program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2012. A bill to provide that certain regulatory actions by the Federal Communications Commission shall have no force or effect; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 2013. A bill to protect the right of individuals to bear arms at water resources de-

velopment projects; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 2014. A bill to provide grants to States to encourage the implementation and maintenance of firearms licensing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2015. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to develop a plain language disclosure form for borrowers of Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2016. A bill to help individuals receiving disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act obtain rehabilitative services and return to the workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 2017. A bill to amend section 116 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. JONES):

S. 2018. A bill to provide Federal matching funding for State-level broadband programs; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2019. A bill to ensure Members of Congress have access to Federal facilities in order to exercise their Constitutional oversight responsibilities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2020. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand the use of telehealth services for remote imaging for chronic eye disease; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2021. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act by striking marijuana use, possession, and distribution as grounds of inadmissibility and removal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 2022. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for improvements to the specially adapted housing program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2023. A bill to modify the Federal and State Technology Partnership Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 2024. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the American History for Freedom grant program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 2025. A bill to amend the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 to modify

the definition of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2026. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2027. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the scope of the Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2028. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for new markets tax credit investments in the Rural Jobs Zone; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 2029. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Indian coal production tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2030. A bill to prevent Federal agencies from interfering with the marijuana policy of States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 2031. A bill to amend the FAST Act to allow States to include information on small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans in reporting under the disadvantaged business enterprises program of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TLLIS, Mr. KAINE, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2032. A bill to expand research on the cannabidiol and marijuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 2033. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate standards and regulations requiring all new commercial motor vehicles to be equipped with technology to limit maximum operating speed, to require existing speed-limiting technologies already installed in certain commercial motor vehicles to be used while in operation, and to require that maximum safe operating speed of commercial motor vehicles shall not exceed 65 miles per hour; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2034. A bill to authorize small business development centers to provide cybersecurity assistance to small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2035. A bill to require the Transportation Security Administration to develop a strategic plan to expand eligibility for the PreCheck Program to individuals with Transportation Worker Identification Credentials or Hazardous Materials Endorsements; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2036. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide grants to States for summer employment programs for youth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 2037. A bill to amend the STEM education program for American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian students under the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2038. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credit for alternative fuel vehicle refueling property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the issuance of exempt facility bonds for zero-emission vehicle infrastructure; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2040. A bill to establish a working group on electric vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2041. A bill to establish the Green Spaces, Green Vehicles Initiative to facilitate the installation of zero-emissions vehicle infrastructure on National Forest System land, National Park System land, and certain related land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2042. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KAINE, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2043. A bill to provide incentives for hate crime reporting, provide grants for State-run hate crime hotlines, and establish alternative sentencing for individuals convicted under the Matthew Shephard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 2044. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to establish an Aging Infrastructure Account, to amend the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978 to provide additional funds under that Act, to establish a review of flood control rule curves pilot project within the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2045. A bill to reauthorize the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 2046. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to protect the health care benefits of retired public safety officers, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2047. A bill to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 267. A resolution recognizing the September 11th National Memorial Trail as an important trail and greenway all individuals should enjoy in honor of the heroes of September 11th; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. Res. 268. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should not bail out any State; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. Res. 269. A resolution commemorating the life of Luis Alejandro "Alex" Villamayor and calling for justice and accountability; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 270. A resolution recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Stonewall uprising; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. Res. 271. A resolution designating July 12, 2019, as "Collector Car Appreciation Day" and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. INHOPE, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Con. Res. 21. A concurrent resolution strongly condemning human rights violations, violence against civilians, and cooperation with Iran by the Houthi movement and its allies in Yemen; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 110

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 110, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a permanent extension of the lower income threshold for the medical expense deduction.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 210, a bill to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancements in public safety services to Indian communities, and for other purposes.

S. 235

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 235, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to establish teacher leader development programs.

S. 239

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 239, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to provide for the administration of certain national monuments, to establish a National Monument Enhancement Fund, and to establish certain wilderness areas in the States of New Mexico and Nevada.

S. 546

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, *supra*.

S. 560

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 560, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of

whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 678

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 678, a bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

S. 684

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 684, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to combat international extremism by addressing global fragility and violence and stabilizing conflict-affected areas, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.

S. 851

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 851, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

S. 872

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 872, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign \$20 Federal reserve notes so as to include a likeness of Harriet Tubman, and for other purposes.

S. 876

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 876, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to prepare veterans for careers in the energy industry, including the solar, wind, cybersecurity, and other low-carbon emissions sectors or zero-emissions sectors of the energy industry, and for other purposes.

S. 1071

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1071, a bill to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 1227

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1227, a bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to study the role of intermediaries in the pharmaceutical supply chain and provide Congress with appropriate policy recommendations, and for other purposes.

S. 1243

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1243, a bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes.

S. 1392

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1392, a bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the responsibilities, workload, and vacancy rates of suicide prevention coordinators of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1428

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1428, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit treatment of student loan payments as elective deferrals for purposes of employer matching contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 1457

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1457, a bill to provide for interagency coordination on risk mitigation in the communications equipment and services marketplace and the supply chain thereof, and for other purposes.

S. 1488

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1488, a bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes.

S. 1531

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1531, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for health insurance consumers from surprise billing.

S. 1625

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms.

COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1625, a bill to promote the deployment of commercial fifth-generation mobile networks and the sharing of information with communications providers in the United States regarding security risks to the networks of those providers, and for other purposes.

S. 1757

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1768

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1768, a bill to clarify that noncommercial species found entirely within the borders of a single State are not interstate commerce or subject to regulation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 or any other provision of law enacted as an exercise of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

S. 1847

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1847, a bill to require group health plans and group or individual health insurance coverage to provide coverage for over-the-counter contraceptives.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the sites associated with the life and legacy of the noted American philanthropist and business executive Julius Rosenwald, with a special focus on the Rosenwald Schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1986

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1986, a bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination based on source of income, veteran status, or military status.

S. RES. 252

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 252, a resolution designating September 2019 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

AMENDMENT NO. 556

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from

Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 556 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 703

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 703 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 742

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 742 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 883

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 883 proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms.

HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2008. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, half a century ago, members of the LGBTQIA+ community, who were tired of being accosted and abused and assaulted just because of who they were or whom they loved, took a stand to say “enough is enough” and pushed back against the forces of history that said they were anything less than.

Thanks to the sacrifice of freedom fighters like Marsha P. Johnson, Sylvia Rivera, and so many others both named and unnamed who dared that day to live their entire truth, countless others today have been set free. Now, 50 years later, through dogged persistence and sacrifice, we have been able to pass laws and create policies that respect and protect members of the LGBTQIA+ community—from challenging hateful bans against lesbian and gay relationships, to securing landmark civil rights protections against hate crimes, to, finally, making marriage equality the law of our land.

This year, as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall protests that sparked the modern movement for LGBTQ equality, I am very proud to stand here on the floor of the Senate as an unapologetic ally for this vibrant community.

As we close out this month’s annual celebration of Pride, I come to the floor today to reintroduce legislation to further protect gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, asexual, and gender nonconforming individuals from the dogma of our Nation’s homophobic and transphobic past because, even as we reflect on the progress we have made, we have a lot more to do to achieve equality.

In the Senate, I have been very proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with the community in Washington State and around the country in order to continue our progress and work to expand protections to help members of the community thrive, from our efforts to reduce bullying and harassment at colleges and universities through legislation named after Tyler Clementi—a student who tragically died by suicide in college—to reducing the epidemic of harassment and discrimination in workplaces through the Be HEARD Act, which is a bill I recently introduced that would hold businesses accountable for harassment and discrimination, give workers the resources and support they need to seek justice, and clarify that discriminating on the basis

of sexual orientation and gender identity are unlawful under the Civil Rights Act.

I am very grateful to my colleague Senator BOOKER and our friend Representative LIEU for joining me today in reintroducing the Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act—the first Federal ban on so-called conversion therapy—because, in 2019, we know that being a member of the LGBTQIA+ community isn’t an affliction, a disease, or some chronic condition that requires medical treatment; rather, the politicians who say it is are on the wrong side of history.

In fact, we know that conversion therapy is a painful and discriminatory practice. The American Psychological Association has said it “is unlikely to be successful in changing someone’s sexual orientation” and would “involve some risk of harm” contrary to the claims of practitioners and advocates. It is also a practice that is especially harmful to LGBTQIA+ children, who we already know are vulnerable to increased harassment and discrimination because of who they are.

I am proud that my home State of Washington has already banned conversion therapy, but that is not enough so long as any child or any person in our country can be harmed by this sham practice. That is why I am very proud to be here to reintroduce the Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act and to remind all of our friends that we stand with them throughout history and throughout the future to make sure they are protected with their rights.

The Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act is legislation that would classify conversion therapy as the fraudulent practice our communities and science know it is. It would clarify in our Nation’s laws that providing or facilitating commercial conversion therapy or facilitating or advertising such services is an unfair and deceptive practice, and it would ensure that Federal regulators and State attorneys general have the ability and authority to enforce this ban.

We have come far in our long battle for LGBTQIA+ equality, and I am ready to get to work to get this important legislation over the finish line because, after 50 years of struggle, as a nation, we have come to know that love is love and that love wins. However, after 50 years, we also know it gets better but only if we work to make it so.

From the horrors of the Pulse massacre, to the ever-climbing number of murdered African-American and Latinx transgender women, to President Trump’s transgender military ban and his administration’s continuous assault on LGBTQIA+ rights, so many of the challenges that face the community today mirror the critical struggles they faced all those years ago at the Stonewall Inn. Like then, too many in the community are still threatened by even greater danger because they are also women, transgender, people of color, poor, and the list goes on.

That is why this legislation and recognitions like Pride Month are so important. All month, I have been thrilled to see the photos from Pride celebrations back in Washington State—from Spokane, to Yakima, to Olympia—filled with so much cheer, resilience, and strength, only to come back here to Washington and argue in this Chamber about why we shouldn't confirm people to judicial or executive posts who don't believe in the full humanity and equality of so many of our family members, friends, neighbors, and coworkers.

It is obvious that this work is still very important, and we have it cut out for us, but I remain hopeful because I have seen how far we have come in just 50 years. By continuing to honor the righteous tradition of Marsha, Sylvia, and so many others by raising our voices against injustice and taking key steps like this legislation to make life easier for the next generation of LGBTQIA+ Americans, I know we will see even more progress in the next 50 years.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. JONES):

S. 2018. A bill to provide Federal matching funding for State-level broadband programs; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the American Broadband Buildout Act of 2019, or ABBA. This legislation would help ensure that rural Americans have access to broadband services at speeds they need to fully participate in the benefits of our modern society and economy regardless of whether they live in the largest cities or the smallest towns. I am delighted to be joined by my friend and colleague Senator DOUG JONES in introducing this bill.

Twenty-five years ago, when the internet was known as the World Wide Web, Americans typically accessed the web using their home phone lines via modems capable of downloading data at just 56 kilobits per second—too slow even to support MP3-quality streaming music. Today, the threshold for broadband service as defined by the FCC allows downloads at speeds nearly 500 times faster—25 megabits per second. At these speeds, Americans not only can watch their favorite movies on demand in the comfort of their very own living rooms but can also participate in the global economy while working from home, upgrade their skills through online education, stay connected to their families as they age in place, and access healthcare through advances in telemedicine.

While the increase in broadband speeds has been dramatic and is encouraging, these numbers mask a disparity between urban and rural Americans. Nearly all Americans living in urban areas have access to the internet at speeds that meet the FCC's broadband threshold, while one in four rural Americans does not.

Similar disparities occur in terms of broadband adoption—the rate at which Americans subscribe to broadband service if they have access to it. According to the Pew Research Center survey last year, 22 percent of rural Americans don't use the internet at home, compared to just 8 percent of urban Americans.

The bipartisan bill that we are introducing would help close the digital divide between urban and rural America by directing the FCC to provide up to \$5 billion in matching grants to assist States and State-approved entities in building “last-mile” infrastructure to bring high-speed broadband directly to homes and businesses in areas that lack it. Let me briefly discuss a few key points about the bill that I would like to highlight.

First, projects that receive funding must be located in unserved areas where broadband is unavailable at speeds that meet the FCC standards. Narrowing the focus to those areas will ensure that the money goes where it is needed most and will also protect against overbuilding where broadband infrastructure is already in place.

Second—and this is important—the bill requires that this Federal funding be matched through public-private partnerships between the broadband service provider and the State in which the last-mile infrastructure project will be built. This means that States and their private sector partners will have “skin in the game” to balance the Federal commitment, ensuring that projects will be well thought out and designed to be sustainable.

Third, the bill requires that projects be designed to be “future proof,” meaning that the infrastructure installed must be capable of delivering higher speeds as broadband accelerates in the future. This will ensure that Federal tax dollars are used to help build a network that serves rural Americans now and in the future without our having to rebuild it every time technology advances.

Furthermore, the bill directs the FCC to prioritize the funding of projects in States that have traditionally lagged behind the national average in terms of broadband subscribers and are at risk of falling further behind as broadband speeds increase.

Finally, the bill provides grants for states and state-designated entities for digital literacy and public awareness campaigns, highlighting the benefits and possibilities of broadband service and helping to attract employers to rural parts of our country in which broadband services are lacking and yet are essential for a business's success. The key reason to do this is to address the disparity in the adoption rates I have already mentioned, which will help drive down the costs of the service and make it more affordable for everyone.

One broadband application that holds special promise for rural America is telemedicine. As a native of Aroostook

County—the largest county by land area east of the Mississippi, with fewer than 70,000 residents—I know how important healthcare is to the vitality and even to the survival of rural communities. Often, these communities struggle to attract and retain the physicians they need to ensure their having access to quality care for their citizens. Broadband can help to bridge this gap by enabling innovative healthcare delivery in these rural communities.

In an example described to me in a recent letter, hospice workers at Northern Light Home Care and Hospice were able to use the internet and video technology to help support a patient who was living on an island off the coast of Maine—not as far as the seagull flies but hours away in travel time. Although the connection was very poor, the video enabled the hospice nurses to monitor the patient's symptoms and provide emotional support to her family. As the author of that letter, Lisa Harvey-McPherson, put it, “Our hospice team could be doing so much more with video and telemonitoring technologies if Maine had better connectivity.”

I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks, this letter from Lisa Harvey-McPherson be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, in closing, rural Americans deserve to enjoy the benefits of high-speed internet in the same way that urban Americans do, but a digital divide has arisen due to the simple fact that rural areas are more sparsely populated than urban ones and are therefore more expensive to serve. The bill that Senator JONES and I are introducing today would help to bridge this digital divide by funding future-proof broadband where it is needed most and giving a real boost to job creation in rural America.

I urge my colleagues to support our bill.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHERN LIGHT HEALTH,  
Brewer, ME, May 13, 2019.

Senator SUSAN COLLINS,  
Dirksen Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of Northern Light Health member organizations and the patients we serve, I want to thank you for your support for the need to advance health care technology in Maine. Technology is an essential strategy to increase access to health care services in rural Maine. Northern Light Health is a technology leader in Maine providing a variety of telehealth services including cardiology, stroke, psychiatry, trauma, pediatric intensive care and in-home telemonitoring services state wide. As we work to expand opportunities for patients to receive health care services through technology we consistently encounter the challenge of inadequate (or absent) broadband capacity. Northern Light Health member organizations compete nationally to recruit specialists to Maine, technology is often the only option to expand access to specialists in rural Maine.

The following Northern Light Health examples highlight technology opportunities

and the need to increase broadband speed and capacity in rural Maine.

Our hospice program cared for a patient on an island off Hancock County. Staff placed a tablet at the patient's home and one with the hospice nurse. Because of the challenges of Island travel, it took hours to get to the home to manage and support the patient and her family. While the broadband connection was very poor we were able to help with symptoms and emotional support using video technology. Our hospice team could be doing so much more with video and telemonitoring technologies if Maine had better connectivity.

At Northern Light AR Gould in Presque Isle, they are a pilot site for the telehealth virtual walk-in clinic. Those using the system within the pilot are amazed at the ease of access to a provider to ask those easy questions that keep patients out of the ED. If successful, in a broader roll-out, patients in local communities will have access to walk-in level care (colds, rashes, general health questions) without leaving their home via technology. This is important given the average age of the population and the difficulty of traveling roads during the winter months in Aroostook County. The barrier to fully expanding the telehealth virtual clinic is broadband capacity.

Broadband access is also a professional recruitment tool, often provider spouses have difficulty finding meaningful employment. Addressing rural broadband capacity will support remote work.

In Aroostook County we are also evaluating telepsychiatry services for the regional nursing homes. This will significantly increase access to psychiatry services which is in clinical demand. Connectivity is a foundational component of offering this service.

Our electronic health record has expanded access to individualized health information for our patients, connectivity is a barrier to patients accessing this important resource in rural Maine.

As we increase our electronic health record capacity providers are reliant on this technology as much as they are reliant on clinical tools like a stethoscope. In areas with broadband capacity challenges the providers spend time looking at buffering symbols on their screens for long periods of time in the day.

We appreciate the opportunity to share these examples with you and your staff as you explore Congressional solutions to Maine's broadband challenge.

Sincerely,

LISA HARVEY-MCPHERSON  
RN, MBA, MPPM,  
Vice President Govern-  
ment Relations.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2026. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

In 2010, Congress passed the Healthy and Hunger-Free Kids Act, which reauthorized child nutrition programs and made healthy meal choices a reality to children nationwide. Far too many children and adolescents in the United States suffer from obesity, which puts them at risk for developing chronic health conditions later in life. One of the best ways to help students make

healthy choices is to teach them about their food and how it is grown. Making that connection makes a difference. That is why I championed the inclusion of funding for a farm to school grant program, which was included in the Healthy and Hunger-Free Kids Act.

The program has had tremendous success and interest nationwide, and has awarded grants in all 50 states and the District of Columbia to support programs in more than 33,000 schools. Building upon the success of this program, I am glad to be joined today by Senators PERDUE, BROWN, and COLLINS in introducing the Farm to School Act of 2019. In years past, I have championed this important farm to school legislative effort with one of my dearest friends, Thad Cochran, who sadly passed away last month.

We all know that hungry children cannot learn. Studies have shown that healthy nutrition in a young person's diet is crucial to cognitive ability and better health in the long run. Food insecurity and obesity rates are still too high in this country, resulting in poor health, and learning and behavioral difficulties at school. The school meal program has made tremendous strides in recent years to ensure not only that children have access to meals throughout the school day, but that those meals are nutritious. The Farm to School program has given children and schools across the country the tools to craft farm-fresh, healthy, and delicious meals that students enjoy.

The Farm to School grant program offers support to farmers and local economies, while teaching kids about nutritious foods and how they are grown. The program has a strong educational component, making our school cafeterias an extension of the classroom, giving students an opportunity to learn about nutrition, well-balanced meals, and even how to grow the food themselves.

In Vermont, I have seen first-hand how farm to school efforts have better connected children with the food in their cafeteria. Students participate in school gardens, sustainability projects, and taste tests for new school menu items. With the help of a USDA Farm to School grant, the Burlington School Food Project has created a partnership with a local Vermont beef processor and 100 percent of the beef served the last school year was locally sourced, and that will continue next year as well. Organizations in Vermont such as Vermont Food Education Every Day, Shelburne Farms, and the Northeast Organic Farming Association have been able to expand their programs to link more farms to the classroom throughout Vermont.

Farm to school is equally crucial to farmers and ranchers by opening another market to them to sell their locally grown and locally harvested goods. The program links the classroom with the farm to engage students in the importance of farming and contributing to the local economy. Every

dollar spent on local food generates up to an additional \$2.16 in economic activity.

This program is so popular among school and farmers alike that demand for grants far outpaces available funding. Since the program began in 2013, USDA has received more than 1,900 applications, but has only been able to fund 437 projects. The Farm to School Act of 2019 would build upon the success of the program and expand its reach by increasing the funding for the program to \$15 million per year. The bill also recognizes the importance of growing the program to include preschools, summer food service program sites, and after-school programs.

Ensuring children have enough food to eat is an issue that unites us all. There is simply no excuse that in the wealthiest, most powerful Nation on Earth people go hungry. Small changes in eating habits by children will result in lifelong health benefits for generations to come. The Farm to School program empowers children and their families to make healthy choices now and in the future. As the Senate begins considering reauthorizing the child nutrition bill this year, I look forward to including these improvements in the Farm to School program.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. KAINE, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2032. A bill to expand research on the cannabidiol and marijuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Cannabidiol and Marijuana Research Expansion Act with my colleagues.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that marijuana and its derivatives, like cannabidiol, commonly known as CBD, may be helpful in treating serious medical conditions. However, anecdotal evidence alone cannot be the basis for developing new medications. Rather, medication development must be based on science.

Unfortunately, marijuana research is subject to burdensome regulations which may unintentionally inhibit research and medication development.

The Cannabidiol and Marijuana Research Expansion Act will reduce these barriers without sacrificing security or enabling diversion. It will ensure that marijuana-derived medications are developed using strong scientific evidence, and provide a pathway for the manufacture and distribution of FDA-approved drugs that are based on this research.

First, the bill streamlines the regulatory process for marijuana research. Specifically, it requires the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to quickly approve or deny applications to research CBD or marijuana and establishes a process by which applicants may submit supplemental information, if necessary.



It also improves regulations dealing with changes to approved quantities of marijuana needed for research and approved research protocols. These improvements will eliminate lengthy delays that researchers encounter under current regulations.

Second, this legislation seeks to increase medical research on CBD.

It does so by explicitly authorizing medical and osteopathic schools, research universities, practitioners and pharmaceutical companies to produce the marijuana they need for approved medical research. This will ensure that researchers have access to the material they need to develop proven, effective medicines. Once the FDA approves these medications, pharmaceutical companies are permitted to manufacture and distribute them.

Third, the bill fosters increased communication between doctors and patients.

Because it is a Schedule I drug, some doctors are hesitant to talk to their patients about the potential harms and benefits of using marijuana, CBD, or other marijuana derivatives as a treatment, for fear that they will lose their DEA registrations. Yet, if patients are using marijuana or its derivatives without their doctors' knowledge, it could impact the effectiveness of the care they receive. That is why our bill authorizes these discussions to occur.

Finally, because existing Federal research is lacking, the bill directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to expand and coordinate research to determine the potential medical benefits of CBD or other marijuana-derived medications on serious medical conditions.

I have heard from many parents who have turned to CBD as a last resort to treat their children who have intractable epilepsy. Anecdotally, CBD has produced positive results. I have heard similar stories from people who use marijuana to treat various other medical conditions.

But a common concern echoed in many of these conversations is that there is a lack of understanding about the proper delivery mechanism, dosing, or potential interactions that CBD or marijuana may have with other medications. Some also worry because these products aren't well regulated or factory sealed, and often are labeled incorrectly.

Without additional research, our ability to adequately address these concerns is limited and uninformed.

The need for additional research, along with the need to increase the supply of CBD and marijuana for research purposes, was highlighted in the National Academy of Sciences report, titled "The Health Effects of Cannabis and Cannabinoids: The Current State of Evidence and Recommendations for Research."

I firmly believe that we should reduce the regulatory barriers associated with researching marijuana and CBD. If and when science shows that these

substances are effective in treating serious medical illnesses, we should enable products to be brought to the market with FDA approval. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2036. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide grants to States for summer employment programs for youth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate's attention to the Youth Summer Jobs and Public Service Act of 2019 that I am introducing today with my colleague from Maryland, Senator VAN HOLLEN. This legislation authorizes the Department of Labor to award Summer Employment for Youth grants to connect youth with jobs that serve their local communities and private businesses over the summer months.

Since the mid-1990s, my home city of Baltimore has organized the Youth Works program out of the Mayor's Office of Employment Development. The Youth Works program provides individuals between the ages of 14 to 21 with a summer job with employers ranging from private businesses, local community nonprofit organizations, to city and State government agencies throughout the City. At these summer jobs, participants are provided with meaningful work experiences, are able to learn to develop the attitudes and grit necessary to compete in the workforce, gain exposure to a variety of career fields, and have a safe, stable environment over the summer months during the day. For the 2019 Youth Works session that begins next week, Baltimore youth participating in the program will have a job for five days a week, five hours per day from July 1st through August 2nd and be paid a minimum of \$10.10 per hour for their service.

This program has grown to be one of the largest youth summer employment programs in the Nation. After the unrest in my home city in April 2015, the Federal Department of Labor provided the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation and the Baltimore City's Mayor's Office of Employment with a \$5 million grant to develop innovative job training strategies and work opportunities for youth and young adults across Baltimore. This Federal grant increased the number of individuals able to be served by the Youth Works program from an historic average of 5,000 participants to the more than 8,000 served today. Last year, Youth Works provided 8,600 Baltimoreans with jobs at more than 900 different worksites across my home city. I'm proud to say that some of those individuals who participated in the Youth Works program over the course

of multiple summers while in high school have recently graduated and were hired by State agencies such as the Maryland Department of Natural Resources. Baltimore youth and their families clearly see the value of this program, with more than 14,000 individuals applying for Youth Works slots this upcoming summer.

Unfortunately, due to the lack of funding between the partnership between the City, State, private business, and philanthropic ventures, more than 5,000 Baltimore City youth who sought summer employment will be denied the opportunity to gain experience in the workplace, foster confidence that they are capable of being successful in a new environment, and lose the security of a safe environment over the summer. We can and must do more to help individuals willing and eager to start their careers.

The Youth Summer Jobs and Public Service Act would seek to eliminate the waiting list for Baltimore students seeking to participate in Youth Works or other summer employment programs around the Nation. If enacted, my legislation would allow States to compete for Summer Employment for Youth grants to serve communities like Baltimore that have high concentrations of eligible, low-income youth. The grants would be utilized by local communities to carry out programs like the Youth Works program that provide summer employment opportunities that are directly linked to academic and occupations learning by providing meaningful work experiences. States competing for grants would be required to partner with private businesses to the extent feasible and to prioritize jobs and work opportunities that directly serve their communities, such as through summer employment with local community nonprofit organizations and city and State government agencies. This additional Federal funding can boost existing programs such as Youth Works and allow other communities across Maryland to establish their own programs and develop Maryland's next generation of workforce.

I am proud to lead this Senate effort with my colleague from Maryland and appreciate the work of Representative CEDRIC RICHMOND of Louisiana who initially led this effort in the U.S. House of Representatives and will shortly introduce companion legislation this Congress. I urge my Senate colleagues to join with me in this effort to connect youth with summer employment opportunities and start their journey towards fulfilling, successful careers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objections, so ordered.

S. 2036

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Youth Summer Jobs and Public Service Act of 2019”.

**SEC. 2. GRANTS TO STATES FOR SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR YOUTH.**

Section 129 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3164) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) GRANTS TO STATES FOR SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR YOUTH.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, from the amount appropriated under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall award grants to States to provide assistance to local areas that have high concentrations of eligible youth to enable such local areas to carry out programs described in subsection (c)(1) that provide summer employment opportunities for eligible youth, which are directly linked to academic and occupational learning, as described in subsection (c)(2)(C). In awarding grants under this subsection, a State shall—

“(A) partner with private businesses to the extent feasible to provide employment opportunities at such businesses; and

“(B) prioritize jobs and work opportunities that directly serve the community.

“(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 to carry out this subsection for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2042. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2042

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “National Purple Heart Hall of Honor Commemorative Coin Act”.

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The mission of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor is—

(A) to commemorate the extraordinary sacrifice of servicemembers of the United States who were killed or wounded by enemy action; and

(B) to collect and preserve the stories of Purple Heart recipients from all branches of service and across generations to ensure that all recipients are represented.

(2) The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor first opened its doors on November 10, 2006, in New Windsor, New York.

(3) The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor is collocated with the New Windsor Cantonment State Historic Site.

(4) The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor is the first to recognize the estimated 1,800,000 servicemembers of the United States wounded or killed in action representing recipients from the Civil War to the present day, serving as a living memorial to their sacrifice by sharing their stories through interviews, exhibits, and the Roll of Honor, an interactive computer database of each recipient enrolled.

**SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.**

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the “Secretary”) shall mint and issue the following coins:

(1) \$5 GOLD COINS.—Not more than 50,000 \$5 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 8.359 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(2) \$1 SILVER COINS.—Not more than 400,000 \$1 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 26.73 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and

(C) contain not less than 90 percent silver.

(3) HALF-DOLLAR CLAD COINS.—Not more than 750,000 half-dollar coins which shall—

(A) weigh 11.34 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and

(C) be minted to the specifications for half-dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(b) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

**SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.**

(a) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the mission of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor.

(2) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act there shall be—

(A) a designation of the value of the coin;

(B) an inscription of the year “2021”; and

(C) inscriptions of the words “Liberty”, “In God We Trust”, “United States of America”, and “E Pluribus Unum”.

(b) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc.; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee.

**SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.**

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) MINT FACILITY.—Only the West Point Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue coins minted under this Act only during the 1-year period beginning on January 1, 2021.

**SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.**

(a) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the face value of the coins;

(2) the surcharge provided in section 7(a) with respect to such coins; and

(3) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

**SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge of—

(1) \$35 per coin for the \$5 coin;

(2) \$10 per coin for the \$1 coin; and

(3) \$5 per coin for the half-dollar coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f)(1) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc. to support the mission of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc., including capital improvements to the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor facilities.

(c) AUDITS.—The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc. shall be subject to the audit requirements of section 5134(f)(2) of title 31, United States Code, with regard to the amounts received under subsection (b).

(d) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act). The Secretary of the Treasury may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2047. A bill to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2047

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

**SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**

Section 223(d)(3) of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 1396a note) is amended by striking “June 30, 2019” and inserting “July 14, 2019”.

**SEC. 2. MEDICAID IMPROVEMENT FUND.**

Section 1941(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w-1(b)(1)) is amended by striking “\$6,000,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”.

**SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS**

SENATE RESOLUTION 267—RECOGNIZING THE SEPTEMBER 11TH NATIONAL MEMORIAL TRAIL AS AN IMPORTANT TRAIL AND GREENWAY ALL INDIVIDUALS SHOULD ENJOY IN HONOR OF THE HEROES OF SEPTEMBER 11TH

Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 267

Whereas September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001, is the date of one of the worst terrorist attacks on United States soil, claiming nearly 3,000 lives at the

World Trade Center in New York City, the Pentagon in Virginia, and the Flight 93 crash site near Shanksville, Pennsylvania;

Whereas the United States came together to honor the loved ones who were victims of the attack and the heroes of September 11<sup>th</sup>, including the first responders, in the days, weeks, and months after the attack by erecting the National September 11 Memorial and Museum, the Pentagon Memorial, and the Flight 93 National Memorial;

Whereas, as a further tribute to first responders and the individuals who lost their lives, the September 11<sup>th</sup> National Memorial Trail Alliance, in partnership with State and local governments and other nonprofit organizations, was formed to develop a 1,300-mile trail and greenway to connect the 3 memorials;

Whereas the September 11<sup>th</sup> National Memorial Trail is a biking, hiking, and driving trail that provides a physical link between the 3 memorials;

Whereas the September 11<sup>th</sup> National Memorial Trail passes through Virginia, Maryland, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Delaware, and the District of Columbia;

Whereas the September 11<sup>th</sup> National Memorial Trail forms an unbroken triangle that links the cities, towns, and communities along the trail that are home to State and local memorials and other significant sites that reflect the spirit of United States patriotism and resilience;

Whereas the September 11<sup>th</sup> National Memorial Trail—

(1) starts at the Pentagon Memorial in Arlington, Virginia;

(2) follows the Mt. Vernon Trail and then extends north along the 184-mile Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park;

(3) connects at Cumberland, Maryland, with the 150-mile Great Allegheny Passage, which the Trail then follows to Garrett in Somerset County, Pennsylvania;

(4) turns northeast and continues for approximately 21 miles to the Flight 93 National Memorial;

(5) continues east through the communities and historic sights of Pennsylvania until arriving at the 130-mile Liberty Water Gap Trail in New Jersey, which the Trail then follows to New York City;

(6) continues to the National September 11 Memorial and Museum in New York City;

(7) returns south, following important sections of the East Coast Greenway and connecting the 9/11 Memorial Garden of Reflection to the trail;

(8) continues along the National Mall in Washington, D.C.; and

(9) ends at the Pentagon Memorial;

Whereas the September 11<sup>th</sup> National Memorial Trail serves as an important recreational and transportation venue for promoting tourism, economic development, healthy bodies and minds, and cultural and educational opportunities;

Whereas the September 11<sup>th</sup> National Memorial Trail has the support of States, local communities, and the private sector;

Whereas recognition by the Senate of the September 11<sup>th</sup> National Memorial Trail does not confer any affiliation of the Trail with the National Park Service or the National Trails System;

Whereas recognition by the Senate of the September 11<sup>th</sup> National Memorial Trail does not authorize Federal funds to be expended for any purpose related to the Trail; and

Whereas States, local communities, and the private sector are encouraged to join together to complete the September 11<sup>th</sup> National Memorial Trail: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate recognizes the September 11<sup>th</sup> National Memorial Trail as an important trail and greenway all individ-

uals should enjoy in honor of the heroes of September 11<sup>th</sup>.

SENATE RESOLUTION 268—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT BAIL OUT ANY STATE

Mr. COTTON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 268

Whereas every State in the United States is a sovereign entity with a constitution and the authority to issue sovereign debt;

Whereas the legislature of every State in the United States has the authority to reduce spending or raise taxes to pay the obligations owed by the State;

Whereas officials in every State in the United States have the legal obligation to fully disclose the financial condition of the State to investors who purchase the debt of the State;

Whereas Congress has rejected prior requests from creditors of a State for payment of the defaulted debt of a State; and

Whereas, during the financial crisis in 1842, the Senate requested that the Secretary of the Treasury report to the Senate with respect to any negotiations with any creditor of a State relating to assuming or guaranteeing any debt of the State, to ensure that promises of support by the Federal Government were not proffered: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Federal Government should take no action to redeem, assume, or guarantee any debt, including pension obligations, of a State; and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury should report to Congress any negotiations to engage in actions that would result in an outlay of Federal funds on behalf of creditors of a State.

SENATE RESOLUTION 269—COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF LUIS ALEJANDRO “ALEX” VILLAMAYOR AND CALLING FOR JUSTICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 269

Whereas United States citizen Luis Alejandro “Alex” Villamayor was born on July 3, 1998, to parents Puning Luk Villamayor and Luis Felipe Villamayor in Rockville, Maryland;

Whereas Alex Villamayor is remembered by his family as a smart, loving, and compassionate young man with a good sense of humor, who was committed to his parents, siblings, and friends;

Whereas Alex Villamayor moved with his family at the age of six to Paraguay, where he was a devoted member of his church and always had attention for those less fortunate;

Whereas Alex Villamayor graduated with honors from Paraguay’s Pan American International School (PAIS) and was accepted to attend Montgomery College in Maryland in the Fall of 2015;

Whereas Alex Villamayor aspired to study business management and return to Paraguay to pursue a career that would help and support the Paraguayan people;

Whereas Alex Villamayor was murdered on June 27, 2015, in the City of Encarnación in Paraguay;

Whereas Alex Villamayor’s death was wrongfully ruled a suicide by Paraguayan authorities before a comprehensive investigation was carried out;

Whereas, in the initial weeks of the investigation, Paraguayan authorities failed to collect blood and DNA samples from individuals present at the scene of the crime, conduct gunshot residue analysis on individuals present at the crime scene, and collect cellular phone records and data from individuals present at the crime scene;

Whereas, in August 2015, Alex Villamayor’s body was exhumed for additional forensic examination, which found that he had been raped and physically assaulted prior to his death;

Whereas, in August 2015, Paraguayan prosecutor Olga Wilma Araujo Ayala was suspended from the investigation into and legal case related to Alex Villamayor’s death due to mismanagement of the case;

Whereas, in September 2015, Mathias Wilbs, an employee at the property where Alex Villamayor was murdered, admitted in a televised public interview that he had removed the murder weapon from the crime scene and placed another firearm in Alex Villamayor’s hand;

Whereas, in September 2015, Alex Villamayor’s death was ruled a homicide and René Hofstetter and Mathias Wilbs were charged with crimes in relation to Alex Villamayor’s murder;

Whereas, in October 2015, Paraguayan authorities opened a formal investigation of Alain Jacks Díaz de Bedoya for his role in Alex Villamayor’s murder;

Whereas, in November 2016, Paraguayan authorities dropped the charges against Alain Jacks Díaz de Bedoya related to Alex Villamayor’s murder;

Whereas Members of the United States Congress have urged the Government of Paraguay to invite the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide technical assistance for the investigation into Alex Villamayor’s death and the United States Embassy in Asunción, Paraguay has offered such assistance to Paraguayan authorities;

Whereas, to date, the Government of Paraguay has not invited the Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide technical assistance for the investigation into Alex Villamayor’s death;

Whereas the United States embassy in Asunción, Paraguay, and the Department of State have not issued any formal public statements about Alex Villamayor’s murder and the many irregularities in the investigation into his death;

Whereas, in February 2017, outgoing United States Ambassador Leslie A. Basset told media outlets that Alex Villamayor “died under dark circumstances” and that “the investigation and the handling of this case has been worrisome”; and

Whereas, in April 2018, Rene Hofstetter was convicted of homicide and sentenced to 12 years in prison and Mathias Wilbs was sentenced to two years and 10 months on obstruction of justice;

Whereas, in spite of these convictions, media outlets report that others implicated in the murder and cover-up have not been charged; and

Whereas, members of Alex Villamayor’s immediate family continue to face grave physical threats in Paraguay for their pursuit of justice: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the life of United States citizen Luis Alejandro “Alex” Villamayor

and offers condolences to his family and friends;

(2) expresses profound concern about the delays in achieving justice in Alex Villamayor's case;

(3) urges Paraguayan authorities to invite the Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide technical assistance to properly investigate the circumstances surrounding Alex Villamayor's death and assess whether other individuals may have had a role in the crime or cover-up;

(4) urges the Government of Paraguay to provide for the physical security of Alex Villamayor's family and others seeking justice in this case and to properly investigate recent threats against their lives, charging those implicated in such threats;

(5) calls on the Department of State to prioritize justice for Alex Villamayor in its diplomatic engagement with the Government of Paraguay; and

(6) calls on the Department of State to review its procedures for providing services to the families of United States citizens slain or assaulted abroad.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to an exemplary young Marylander whose life was tragically cut short four years ago today. Senator VAN HOLLEN and I have just introduced a resolution which pays tribute to Alex's life, calls for justice and accountability in his murder, and procedures to ensure other families do not suffer this same tragedy.

Luis Alejandro "Alex" Villamayor was born on July 3, 1998, to parents Puning Luk Villamayor and Luis Felipe Villamayor in Rockville, Maryland. Those who knew him remember him as a smart, loving, and compassionate young man with a good sense of humor. Alex was committed to his parents, siblings, and friends. He was a devoted member of his church and always sought to help those less fortunate.

Alex Villamayor moved with his family to Paraguay at the age of six. He attended high school there and graduated with honors from the Pan American International School and was accepted to attend Montgomery College in Maryland in the fall of 2015 to study business management. He ultimately planned to pursue a career to help and support the Paraguayan people, but was tragically murdered on June 27, 2015, in the city of Encarnación.

Alex's death was wrongfully ruled a suicide by Paraguayan authorities, who had not properly investigated the death at that point and failed to collect blood and DNA samples from individuals present at the scene of the crime, conduct gunshot residue analysis, or collect cellular phone records and data from individuals present at the crime scene.

After Alex's family noted gross inconsistencies in accounts of his death, Alex's body was exhumed for additional forensic examination, which found that he had been raped and physically assaulted prior to his death. Finally, in September 2015, Alex's death was ruled a homicide. René Hofstetter and Mathias Wilbs were charged with crimes in relation to Alex Villamayor's murder and Paraguayan authorities opened a formal investigation of Alain Jacks

Díaz de Bedoya, who was also present at the time of Alex's death. While the charges against Mr. Díaz de Bedoya were eventually dropped, in April 2018 René Hofstetter was convicted of homicide and sentenced to 12 years in prison and Mathias Wilbs was sentenced to two years and 10 months on obstruction of justice.

In spite of these convictions, I remain concerned about the handling of this case. In spite of an offer to assist, the Government of Paraguay never allowed the FBI to provide technical assistance for the investigation. Our Ambassador at the time told media outlets that "the investigation and the handling of this case has been worrisome." Of even greater concern, members of Alex's immediate family continue to face grave physical threats in Paraguay for their pursuit of justice.

Senators VAN HOLLEN and I continue to offer our deepest condolences to the Villamayor family and, through this resolution, call on Paraguayan authorities to finally allow the FBI to assist in this case and provide the necessary protections to Alex's family. We similarly ask the Department of State to prioritize justice for Alex Villamayor in its diplomatic engagement with the Government of Paraguay and to review its procedures for providing services to the families of United States citizens slain or assaulted abroad.

On this sad anniversary, we remain committed to honoring the life of Alex Villamayor and working to ensure this tragic story does not repeat itself.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 270—RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STONEWALL UPRISING

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 270

Whereas the Stonewall Inn opened on or around March 18, 1967, at 53 Christopher Street in the Greenwich Village neighborhood of New York City;

Whereas the neighborhood of Greenwich Village, and establishments like the Stonewall Inn, served as a sanctuary for members of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this preamble as "LGBTQ") community from persecution by police and society at large;

Whereas during the time around the opening of the Stonewall Inn, many State and local governments, including New York City, criminalized how LGBTQ individuals express their identities and relationships, which resulted in LGBTQ individuals frequently being harassed by law enforcement, including the New York City Police Department (referred to in this preamble as the "NYPD");

Whereas LGBTQ individuals had begun to stand up to such police harassment, including at Cooper Do-nuts in Los Angeles in 1959, Compton's Cafeteria in San Francisco in 1966, and Black Cat Tavern in Los Angeles in 1967;

Whereas, in the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, the NYPD raided the Stonewall Inn and arrested many patrons;

Whereas brave individuals, particularly transgender women of color, stood up to injustice the night of June 28, 1969, which sparked an uprising against the NYPD, with confrontations and protests at the Stonewall Inn and the surrounding area lasting until July 3, 1969;

Whereas the Stonewall uprising empowered thousands of LGBTQ individuals to emerge from the shadows and come out publicly as they stood up for their community the night of June 28, 1969 and beyond, putting their lives and safety at risk;

Whereas, along with public protests in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Washington, D.C., and elsewhere, the Stonewall uprising became a catalyst for the LGBTQ civil rights movement to secure social and political equality and inspired the formation of many advocacy organizations;

Whereas, on June 27-28, 1970, members of the LGBTQ community commemorated the first anniversary of Stonewall and reaffirmed the solidarity of the LGBTQ community by organizing the first Pride marches, or gatherings, in New York City, San Francisco, Chicago, and Los Angeles;

Whereas the Stonewall uprising is remembered and celebrated every year in June during "LGBTQ Pride Month";

Whereas in June 2016 the Stonewall Inn and its surrounding area was declared a national monument, becoming the first national monument to commemorate the LGBTQ civil rights movement;

Whereas WorldPride will be held in June 2019 for the first time in the United States in New York City to commemorate the Stonewall uprising, bringing representatives of the global LGBTQ community to recognize these historic events;

Whereas on May 30, 2019, New York City announced that it would dedicate a monument honoring pioneering transgender activists and key leaders in the Stonewall uprising, Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera, the first permanent public monument in the world honoring transgender women;

Whereas on June 6, 2019, the NYPD officially apologized for the raid on the Stonewall Inn;

Whereas, despite the progress made since the Stonewall uprising, members of the LGBTQ community have experienced biased policing and are still at significant risk of violence and discrimination;

Whereas, according to the annual hate crimes report published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, LGBTQ individuals, particularly LGBTQ individuals of color, continue to be the target of bias-motivated violence, and efforts to address this violence may be hindered by a continued lack of trust in law enforcement;

Whereas not less than 100 transgender individuals, primarily women of color, have been murdered in the United States since the beginning of 2015; and

Whereas no individual in the United States should have to fear being the target of violence because of who they are or who they love: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 50th Anniversary of the Stonewall uprising;

(2) condemns violence and discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community and recommits itself to securing justice,

equality, and well-being for LGBTQ individuals; and

(3) commends the bravery, solidarity, and resiliency of the LGBTQ community in the face of violence and discrimination, both past and present.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 271—DESIGNATING JULY 12, 2019, AS “COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY” AND RECOGNIZING THAT THE COLLECTION AND RESTORATION OF HISTORIC AND CLASSIC CARS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF PRESERVING THE TECHNOLOGICAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES**

Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

**S. RES. 271**

Whereas many people in the United States maintain classic automobiles as a pastime and do so with great passion and as a means of individual expression;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the effect that the more than 100-year history of the automobile has had on the economic progress of the United States and supports wholeheartedly all activities involved in the restoration and exhibition of classic automobiles;

Whereas the collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity shared across generations and across all segments of society;

Whereas thousands of local car clubs and related businesses have been instrumental in preserving a historic part of the heritage of the United States by encouraging the restoration and exhibition of such vintage works of art;

Whereas automotive restoration provides well-paying, high-skilled jobs for people in all 50 States; and

Whereas automobiles have provided the inspiration for music, photography, cinema, fashion, and other artistic pursuits that have become part of the popular culture of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 12, 2019, as “Collector Car Appreciation Day”;

(2) recognizes that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to engage in events and commemorations of Collector Car Appreciation Day that create opportunities for collector car owners to educate young people about the importance of preserving the cultural heritage of the United States, including through the collection and restoration of collector cars.

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21—STRONGLY CONDEMNING HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS, VIOLENCE AGAINST CIVILIANS, AND COOPERATION WITH IRAN BY THE HOUTHJI MOVEMENT AND ITS ALLIES IN YEMEN**

Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following concurrent

resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

**S. CON. RES. 21**

Whereas, in 2014 and 2015, the Houthi movement, also known as Ansar Allah, and its allies attacked Yemen’s internationally recognized government and seized control of the capital, Sana’a, and the port city of Aden;

Whereas, since 2015, the Houthis have expanded their armed campaign beyond Yemen’s borders to target civilian infrastructure in Saudi Arabia and possibly beyond, including hundreds of missile and drone attacks against civilian targets in Saudi Arabia that have killed innocent civilians;

Whereas the Houthi movement’s slogan is, “God is great! Death to America! Death to Israel! Curse upon the Jews! Victory to Islam!”;

Whereas al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria—Yemen Province have taken advantage of the Yemeni civil war to expand their territory and resources;

Whereas Iran and its proxies have provided direct financial, material, and logistical support to the Houthis for at least a decade;

Whereas the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen has found that Iran is in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2216 (2015) for supplying the Houthis with missiles and drones;

Whereas the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait between Yemen, Djibouti, and Eritrea, which connects the Suez Canal and Red Sea to the Indian Ocean, is a strategically important transit point for a significant amount of global trade each year;

Whereas the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait is the world’s fourth-largest transit point for oil shipments;

Whereas, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

Whereas, in October 2016, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

Whereas, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

Whereas, on May 23, 2018, a Houthi missile hit a Turkish-flagged ship carrying wheat to a Yemeni port;

Whereas the United Nations warned on February 14, 2019, that approximately 24,000,000 people in Yemen are in need of humanitarian assistance and protection, with most living in territory currently held by the Houthis;

Whereas the United Nations also estimates that 7,400,000 people in Yemen are in need of treatment for malnutrition, including 2,000,000 children under 5 years of age;

Whereas according to Human Rights Watch, the extensive use of land mines by the Houthis has killed and maimed hundreds of civilians and cut off entire communities from their crops, clean water, and humanitarian aid;

Whereas, on June 21, 2019, the World Food Programme announced that it was partially suspending aid to parts of Yemen controlled by the Houthis because of interference with food distribution and aid convoys and the misappropriation of food by Houthi officials;

Whereas Reporters Without Borders estimated that, as of March 2019, at least 16 journalists were being held hostage by the Houthis, with 10 of them facing possible execution following years of torture and starvation;

Whereas, according to Human Rights Watch, the Houthis have undertaken a deliberate campaign of kidnapping, torture, and abuse against students, human rights defenders, political opponents, and religious minorities;

Whereas Houthi missile and drone attacks on June 12, 2019, and June 23, 2019, killed 1 civilian and injured 47 others at Abha International Airport in southern Saudi Arabia;

Whereas, according to United States Central Command, on June 6, 2019, a Houthi surface to air missile shot down a United States MQ-9 Reaper drone over Yemen, demonstrating a new Houthi capability that United States Central Command assessed was enabled by Iranian assistance;

Whereas, on December 18, 2018, a cease-fire took effect in the port of Hodeidah, Yemen, which is the entry point for 70 percent of humanitarian aid in the country;

Whereas the Houthis did not begin removing their forces from Hodeidah and two other ports, part of phase one of the December 2018 ceasefire and withdrawal agreement agreed to in Stockholm, Sweden, until May 2019;

Whereas according to the United Nations monitoring mission in Hodeidah, the Houthis had not removed many of their military installations and equipment from the port city as of June 12, 2019; and

Whereas, on June 24, 2019, the United States, United Kingdom, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates released a joint statement that raised concerns that Iranian activities were destabilizing both Yemen and the broader region, reaffirmed support for the efforts of United Nations Special Envoy Martin Griffiths, and called on all parties in Yemen to accelerate implementation of the Stockholm agreement: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That Congress—

(1) condemns the Houthi movement in Yemen for—

(A) its blatant disregard for human rights and innocent life;

(B) its ideology of hate toward Israel and Jewish people both in Yemen and around the world;

(C) preventing critical humanitarian aid from reaching people in Yemen;

(D) the targeting of international commerce in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait; and

(E) missile and drone attacks against civilians;

(2) expresses concern about Iran’s extensive support for the Houthis and the economic and security consequences for the region of an Iranian foothold on the Arabian Peninsula;

(3) urges the Houthis and other parties in the Yemeni civil war to uphold the terms of the December 2018 ceasefire and withdrawal agreement agreed to in Stockholm, Sweden; and

(4) urges the United States Government to support a peace process to end the civil war and humanitarian crisis in Yemen while preventing Iran and terrorist groups, including al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria—Yemen Province, from gaining a permanent foothold on the Arabian Peninsula.

**AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED**

SA 904. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HOEVEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 50, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional

fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes.

SA 905. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. HOEVEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 212, to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 904. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. HOEVEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 50, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 3, line 23, strike “such sums as are necessary” and insert “\$11,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2025”.

SA 905. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. HOEVEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 212, to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities; as follows:

On page 12, line 16, insert “the extent to which the programs and services overlap or are duplicative,” after “development.”

#### NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator JACKY ROSEN, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Troy D. Edgar, of California, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, dated June 27, 2019.

I, Senator JACKY ROSEN, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Chad F. Wolf, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans, Department of Homeland Security, dated June 27, 2019.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate

on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

#### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Peter Joseph Phipps, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Charles R. Eskridge III, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, William Shaw Stickman IV, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Jennifer Philpott Wilson, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and Wilmer Ocasio, to be United States Marshal for the District of Puerto Rico, Department of Justice.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jake Vance and James Schmidt, legislative correspondents in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my defense fellow, Joshua Culver, be granted floor privileges for the length of the current debate on the NDAA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following members of my staff from Ohio and Washington be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day: Diana Baron, Mary Topolinski, Shileshea Bamberg, Alea Brown, John Patterson, Joe Gilligan, Ann Longsworth Orr, and John Ryan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar Nos. 300 through 325 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force,

Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, considered and confirmed, are as follows:

#### IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

#### To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Gene F. Price

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

#### To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Shawn E. Duane

Rear Adm. (1h) Scott D. Jones

Rear Adm. (1h) John B. Mustin

Rear Adm. (1h) John A. Schommer

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

#### To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Alan J. Reyes

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

#### To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Troy M. McClelland

#### IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Charles A. Flynn

#### IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

#### To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Mark E. Moritz

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

#### To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Christopher A. Asselta

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

#### To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Michael T. Curran

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

#### To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Leslie E. Reardanz, III

The following named officers for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

#### To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Kenneth R. Blackmon

Capt. Robert C. Nowakowski

Capt. Thomas S. Wall  
Capt. Larry D. Watkins

The following named officers for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

Capt. Scott K. Fuller  
Capt. Michael J. Steffen

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

Capt. Paula D. Dunn

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

Capt. Pamela C. Miller

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be general*

Gen. John W. Raymond

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be general*

Lt. Gen. Paul J. LaCamera

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

Maj. Gen. Michael E. Kurilla

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be vice admiral*

Rear Adm. Ricky L. Williamson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

Capt. Philip W. Yu

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

*To be brigadier general*

Col. Arthur P. Wunder

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army as a Chaplain under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624 and 7064:

*To be brigadier general*

Col. William Green, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be vice admiral*

Vice Adm. Phillip G. Sawyer

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade

indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

Lt. Gen. Eric P. Wendt

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. Michael R. Berry

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Michel M. Russell, Sr.

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Joseph L. Biehler

Brig. Gen. William B. Blaylock, II

Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Bouchard

Brig. Gen. Paul B. Chauncey, III

Brig. Gen. Johanna P. Clyborne

Brig. Gen. William J. Edwards

Brig. Gen. Lee M. Ellis

Brig. Gen. Pablo Estrada, Jr.

Brig. Gen. Lapthe C. Flora

Brig. Gen. Troy D. Galloway

Brig. Gen. Lee W. Hopkins

Brig. Gen. Marvin T. Hunt

Brig. Gen. Mark C. Jackson

Brig. Gen. Richard F. Johnson

Brig. Gen. Tim C. Lawson

Brig. Gen. Kevin D. Lyons

Brig. Gen. Michael A. Mitchell

Brig. Gen. Michel A. Natali

Brig. Gen. Chad J. Parker

Brig. Gen. Gregory C. Porter

Brig. Gen. Jeffrey D. Smiley

Brig. Gen. David N. Vesper

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

Capt. Huan T. Nguyen

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S

DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN426 AIR FORCE nominations (43) beginning THOMAS JOSEPH ALFORD, and ending GABRIEL MATTHEW YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN651 AIR FORCE nominations (16) beginning ELBERT R. ALFORD, IV, and ending TRACIE L. SWINGLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN731 AIR FORCE nomination of Catherine M. Tolvo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN732 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning CHRISTIAN F. COOPER, and ending RYAN E. SNYDER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN733 AIR FORCE nominations (9) beginning KEITH A. BERRY, and ending STEVEN P. ROGERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN803 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning HASSAN N. BATAYNEH, and ending

ASAD U. QAMAR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN842 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning JASON A. KOSKINEN, and ending ROBIN T. BINGHAM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2019.

IN THE ARMY

PN431 ARMY nominations (15) beginning JASON BULLOCK, and ending DEMETRES WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN432 ARMY nominations (75) beginning JULIE A. AKE, and ending D013176, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN534 ARMY nomination of Shane R. Reeves, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 26, 2019.

PN659 ARMY nominations (19) beginning ALWYNMICHAEL S. ALBANO, and ending STANTON D. TROTTER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN663 ARMY nominations (167) beginning JASON B. ALISANGCO, and ending D014026, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN664 ARMY nominations (28) beginning MICHAEL M. ARMSTRONG, and ending MIAO X. ZHOU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN734 ARMY nominations (3) beginning GLENN N. JUMAN, and ending RUSSELL T. MCNEAR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN736 ARMY nomination of Carmen Y. Salcedo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN737 ARMY nominations (2) beginning RUSSELL F. DUBOSE, and ending TIMOTHY D. FORREST, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN804 ARMY nominations (33) beginning MICHAEL J. BALLARD, and ending D015102, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN805 ARMY nomination of Andre L. Thomas, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN806 ARMY nomination of D013839, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN807 ARMY nomination of Christopher B. Nettles, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN808 ARMY nominations (490) beginning EDWARD C. ADAMS, and ending G010558, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN809 ARMY nominations (419) beginning CHARLES M. ABEYAWARDENA, and ending G010449, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN810 ARMY nominations (308) beginning JOHN R. ABELLA, and ending D014810, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN323 MARINE CORPS nomination of Shawn E. McGowan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN324 MARINE CORPS nomination of Michael R. Lukkes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN327 MARINE CORPS nomination of James Y. Malone, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

#### IN THE NAVY

PN676 NAVY nominations (12) beginning MATTHEW P. BEARE, and ending KEITH A. TUKES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN677 NAVY nominations (27) beginning RICHARD L. BOSWORTH, and ending MATTHEW C. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN678 NAVY nominations (13) beginning LANE C. ASKEW, and ending DONALD V. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN679 NAVY nominations (10) beginning MARK A. ANGELO, and ending GREGORY E. SUTTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN680 NAVY nominations (17) beginning REX A. BOONYOBHAS, and ending SARAH E. ZARRO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN681 NAVY nominations (3) beginning SCOTT DRAYTON, and ending THOMAS R. WAGNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN682 NAVY nominations (11) beginning KEITH ARCHIBALD, and ending DAVID C. WEBBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN683 NAVY nominations (241) beginning MITCHELL W. ALBIN, and ending TODD D. ZENTNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN684 NAVY nominations (15) beginning ADRIAN Z. BEJAR, and ending ROBERT A. WOODRUFF, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN685 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ERIN E. O. ACOSTA, and ending CHRISTI S. MONTGOMERY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN686 NAVY nominations (10) beginning DERECK C. BROWN, and ending SHERRY W. WANGWHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN687 NAVY nominations (4) beginning WILLIAM H. CLINTON, and ending SARAH T. SELFKYLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN688 NAVY nominations (6) beginning JAMES M. BELMONT, and ending JON M. HERSEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN738 NAVY nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL R. BRUNEAU, and ending HANS L. HOLKON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN739 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MICHAEL C. CABASSA, and ending ALLAN J. SANDOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN740 NAVY nominations (14) beginning ERIN G. ADAMS, and ending IAN L. VALERIO, which nominations were received

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN741 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MICHAEL E. HALL, and ending DARREN L. STENNETT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN742 NAVY nominations (24) beginning LILLIAN A. ABUAN, and ending CHARLES M. TELLIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN743 NAVY nominations (16) beginning VIRGINIA S. BLACKMAN, and ending ABIGAIL M. YABLONSKY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN744 NAVY nominations (11) beginning BRIAN J. ELLIS, JR., and ending SYLVAIN W. WONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN745 NAVY nominations (30) beginning ZIAD T. ABOONA, and ending LISA A. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN746 NAVY nominations (75) beginning RUBEN D. ACOSTA, and ending LUKE A. ZABROCKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN747 NAVY nominations (18) beginning DAVID L. BELL, JR., and ending HAROLD S. ZALD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN748 NAVY nominations (8) beginning WILLIAM R. BUTLER, and ending OMARR E. TOBIAS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN749 NAVY nominations (5) beginning BRIAN J. HALL, and ending PHILLIP E. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN750 NAVY nominations (3) beginning ESTHER A. BOPP, and ending ROBERTA S. TAYLOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN751 NAVY nominations (3) beginning FRECHELL I. LEACHMAN, and ending LEE V. K. STUART, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN752 NAVY nominations (15) beginning JEREMY T. CASELLA, and ending JOSEPH M. ZACK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN753 NAVY nominations (94) beginning FREDERICK G. ALEGRE, and ending KENNETH B. WOOSTER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN754 NAVY nominations (4) beginning MIGUEL A. CASTELLANOS, and ending KEVIN A. SCHNITTKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN755 NAVY nominations (2) beginning CHARLOTTE A. BROWNING, and ending RACHEL H. WADEBROWN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN756 NAVY nominations (16) beginning JULIE M. BARR, and ending JACOB S. WIEMANN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN757 NAVY nominations (8) beginning LIAM M. APOSTOL, and ending ANN M. VALLANDINGHAM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN758 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ANTHONY L. LACOURSE, and ending SHANNON C. ZAHUMENSKY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN759 NAVY nominations (2) beginning SCOTT A. HIGGINS, and ending PEIHUA KU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN760 NAVY nominations (17) beginning NATHANIEL A. BAILEY, and ending LEONARD N. WALKER, IV, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN761 NAVY nominations (8) beginning DAVID K. BOYLAN, and ending NED L. SWANSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN762 NAVY nominations (2) beginning ONOFRIO P. MARGIONI, and ending KURT D. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN763 NAVY nominations (4) beginning DAVID L. BACHELOR, and ending THOMAS J. TAYLOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN764 NAVY nominations (3) beginning ANDREW M. COOK, and ending DENIZ M. PISKIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN765 NAVY nomination of Christina M. Allee, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN766 NAVY nomination of David A. Schubkegel, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN767 NAVY nomination of Jon B. Voigtlander, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN768 NAVY nominations (4) beginning REBEKAH R. JOHNSON, and ending ROBERTS. THOMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN769 NAVY nominations (11) beginning MATTHEW A. BUCH, and ending TROY J. SHERRILL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN811 NAVY nomination of Meger D. Chappell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN812 NAVY nomination of Ryan D. Scully, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN813 NAVY nomination of Brandon T. Bridges, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN814 NAVY nomination of Mark S. Javate, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN815 NAVY nomination of Chandler W. Jones, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN816 NAVY nomination of Justin R. Taylor, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN817 NAVY nominations (12) beginning KRISTINE N. BENCH, and ending DAVID A. ZIEMBA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN818 NAVY nominations (25) beginning DIEGO F. ALVARADO, and ending JARED



M. WILHELM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN819 NAVY nominations (8) beginning ANTHONY J. FALVO, IV, and ending BRIAN T. WIERZBICKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN820 NAVY nominations (10) beginning BECKY L. BUJAKI, and ending NICHOLAS T. WALKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN821 NAVY nominations (16) beginning ALBERT E. ARNOLD, IV, and ending JAMES F. WRIGHTSON, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN822 NAVY nominations (27) beginning BRIAN J. BANAZWSKI, and ending EVAN B. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN823 NAVY nominations (20) beginning SHANEL BEAVERS, and ending JOHN J. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN824 NAVY nominations (2) beginning LEVI DESJARLAIS, and ending ANTHONY R. MURPHY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN825 NAVY nomination of Meera Cheerharan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN826 NAVY nomination of Selina D. Bandy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN827 NAVY nominations (45) beginning ROBERT W. BOASE, and ending WALTER J. ZAPP, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN828 NAVY nominations (49) beginning MATE W. AERANDIR, and ending REBECCA L. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN829 NAVY nominations (34) beginning HANNAH L. BEALON, and ending BILLY W. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN830 NAVY nominations (34) beginning BRIELLE L. ADAMOVICH, and ending CHELSEY L. ZWICKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN831 NAVY nominations (512) beginning JOHN I. ACTKINSON, and ending GEORGE S. ZINTAK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN847 NAVY nomination of MARTIN E. ROBERTS, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2019.

PN848 NAVY nominations (3) beginning TODD W. GEYER, and ending ANTHONY J. SMOLA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2019.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 295.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Christopher Scolese, of New York, to be Director of the National Reconnaissance Office. (New Position)

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 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; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Scolese nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 330, 331, and 332.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Gary B. Burman, of Kentucky, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of four years; William D. Hyslop, of Washington, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Washington for the term of four years; Randall P. Huff, of Wyoming, to be United States Marshal for the District of Wyoming for the term of four years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Burman, Hyslop, and Huff nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 113.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Veronica Daigle, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that 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. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Daigle nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 342.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Wallace, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that 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. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Wallace nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 199.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Aimee Kathryn Jorjani, of Wisconsin, to be Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for a term expiring January 19, 2021.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that 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. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Jorjani nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 121.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lane Genatowski, of New York, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, Department of Energy.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that 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. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Genatowski nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 180 and 219.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Ronald Douglas Johnson, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of El Salvador; and David Michael Satterfield, of Missouri, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Turkey.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Johnson and Satterfield nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 109, 110, and 360.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Aditya Bamzai, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for the remainder of the term expiring January 29, 2020; Travis LeBlanc, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2022; and Edward W. Felten, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2025. (Reappointment)

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to be reconsidered be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bamzai, LeBlanc, and Felton nominations?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 343.

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 Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

##### 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 Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Richard C. Shelby, Shelley Moore Capito, Roger F. Wicker, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Tom Cotton, John Thune, Steve Daines, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, John Hoeven, John Barrasso.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 47.

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 T. Kent Wetherell II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of T. Kent Wetherell II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida.

Mitch McConnell, Kevin Cramer, Mike Crapo, Marco Rubio, John Kennedy, Thom Tillis, James M. Inhofe, Rob Portman, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, John Boozman, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Richard C. Shelby, at Roberts, Lindsey Graham, John Hoeven.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 51.

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 Damon Ray Leichty, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

## 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 Damon Ray Leichty, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, John Barrasso, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis, Johnny Isakson, Tim Scott, Mike Braun, Richard Burr, Lindsey Graham.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). 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. 52.

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 J. Nicholas Ranjan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

## 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 J. Nicholas Ranjan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, John Barrasso, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis, Johnny Isakson, Tim Scott, Mike Braun, Richard Burr, Lindsey Graham.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 101.

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 Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

## 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 Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, John Barrasso, David Perdue, James E. Risch, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, Johnny Isakson, Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, Steve Daines, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Kevin Cramer, Richard Burr.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 103.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

## 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 John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, John Barrasso, David Perdue, James E. Risch, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, Johnny Isakson, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, Steve Daines, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Kevin Cramer, Shelley Moore Capito.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency.

Mitch McConnell, Steve Daines, John Thune, John Cornyn, James M. Inhofe, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

CONFIRMATION OF ROB WALLACE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to say just a few words about Rob Wallace, the newly confirmed Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife, and Parks at the Department of Interior.

I have known Rob for over 35 years. Without question, Rob is the right person for the job. Throughout his long and distinguished career, Rob has struck the proper balance between wildlife management, habitat management, and the use of our public lands.

In terms of wildlife conservation, Rob is way up there in terms of his commitment. Rob's experience and leadership in Wyoming and in our Nation's capital are ideally suited for this critically important position.

Throughout his 45-year career, Rob has served in a variety of jobs that directly relate to the two Federal agencies he has been nominated to oversee. Rob began his career as a seasonal park ranger in Grand Teton National Park. Since then, Rob has served in a number of positions. He has been Assistant Director of the National Park Service, chief of staff for Wyoming Senator Malcolm Wallop, staff director for the U.S. Senate Energy and Natural Re-

source Committee—a committee on which I currently sit. He has been chief of staff for Wyoming Governor Jim Geringer, and manager of U.S. Government Relations for the General Electric Company.

Rob currently serves as the president of the Upper Green River Conservancy. It is the Nation's first cooperative conservation bank. Rob cofounded the Upper Green River Conservancy. It protects core sage grouse habitat in the ecologically rich and the energy rich Upper Green River watershed in Southwest Wyoming.

He built an innovative partnership of ranchers, conservation groups, energy companies, investors, and other stakeholders. Rob is also the founding member of the board of the Grand Teton National Park Foundation, a group of people absolutely working together, committed to the Grand Teton National Park. It promotes the park's cultural, historic, and natural resources. He has also served on the boards of many organizations dedicated to conserving wildlife and enhancing our national parks.

Rob's nomination passed the Environment and Public Works Committee by unanimous vote, and a near-unanimous reported vote in the Committee of Energy and Natural Resources.

Rob Wallace is an outstanding choice for this position of Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks. He is the right person for the job, and I am so pleased the Senate has now confirmed his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, the senior Senator from South Carolina, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, and the junior Senator from North Carolina be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions from June 27 through the July 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I am going to try to do this in about 12 minutes, since I am not sure how many people are left to speak tonight and I know the staff worked hard and we will be up early tomorrow voting on the pending Udall amendment. That is what I want to talk about.

I have watched all week the debate on some of these topics. I think it is a really good debate, actually. In some ways, I am very pleased the amendment has been offered because it has given us an opportunity to talk about a topic I don't think we have talked enough about; that is, foreign policy, the security threats before our country, and, in particular, what the role of Congress is in all of this.

There are a couple of things I want to say at the outset. Here is the first. A lot of people who cover this stuff in the news like very simplistic terms. It makes it easier to write the articles and makes it easier to describe the circumstances. The terms people like to use are "hawk," or "dove," or "war-like." I am not in favor of war. I have actually never advocated for a military attack on Iran, in these circumstances especially. There are a lot of reasons for it, but it will take me more than 15 minutes to explain it all. Suffice it to say, it is certainly not the first or the second.

The policy of the United States in Iran today is the one I support; that is, crippling economic sanctions that deny them the money to do the bad things they do but also a forced posture that we are prepared with enough people there in the military, so if they do attack us, we can defend ourselves.

I want to say at the outset that I am not here today to speak in favor of war or to call for war but to speak about reality and the situation as we face it today.

The second thing I want to point to is there is this notion out there that there is some clear-cut constitutional limitation on the President when it comes to the use of force in virtually every circumstance and that somehow the current President is being enabled by the Members of his party here to do whatever he wants. That is just not true. I will explain why in a moment.

I want to begin with why we are even here. It is one of the topics that has been touched on this week, which I think deserves a direct response. I heard a number of Senators who came to the floor. I watched the debate last night, and there will be another one tonight within the Democratic Party. You almost get a sense that what they are arguing is that Iran was under control and wasn't doing anything wrong until Donald Trump came along and pulled us out of the Iran deal. That is just not true. That is patently false.

The only thing Iran wasn't doing is enriching uranium beyond a certain threshold. That is not necessarily a bad thing that they weren't doing it, but that is the only thing that deal covered.

Here is what Iran was still doing. Iran was still sponsors terrorism. You ask, why is it that they sponsor terrorism? Iran wants to be the dominant power in the Middle East, and one of the ways they seek to achieve it is to find all of these groups—Hezbollah, Shia militias in Iraq and Syria, the Houthis in Yemen—and empower those groups.

They have an organization called the IRGC, which is the real military and the real power in Iran. Underneath the IRGC, there is an organization called the Quds Force, which is their covert operations unit led by a guy named General Soleimani. He goes around the entire region sponsoring these groups—training them and providing weapons.

Here is what they hope to do. If they ever get into a conflict, they will use these groups to attack people. Why do they use those groups? No. 1, because Iran doesn't have the ability to station troops all over the region. No. 2, it gives them deniability. They can say: We didn't attack you. It was the Houthis or Shia militia. It allows them some level of deniability while still inflicting pain.

If you want to know what else Iran has done using that strategy, it has maimed or killed hundreds of American service men and women in Iraq. They didn't buy all those IEDs that were blowing up on Amazon; they didn't order them on eBay. They were built and supplied by the Iranians. That is who did it. There is no dispute about that.

President Obama signed this Iran deal. Iran began to get more money into their treasury because they could now engage in certain economic activity. What did Iran do with that money? Let me tell you what they didn't do. They didn't build schools, roads, and bridges. They didn't reinvest it in their economy or their education system. Iran took the money they were making from the Iran deal. The Iran deal now allows them to engage in commerce that they weren't allowed to. They took that extra money, and they used it to sponsor terrorism—to sponsor Hezbollah in Lebanon.

Today Hezbollah not only has more missiles than they had 10 or 15 years ago, but their missiles are better than they were. They could now, theoretically, overwhelm Israel's defenses with barrages of attacks. They have guidance systems on those missiles now. In fact, they have gotten so much assistance from Iran, they don't even need to ship these missiles to them anymore. They can make them themselves.

What about the Houthis? The Houthis are a group that already existed, but they were only able to make the gains they made in Yemen with Iranian support. You read in the news every day about these missiles and drones used by the Houthis to attack Saudi Arabia. It doesn't get a lot of coverage, but where do you think they bought these things from? Do you think they made them? We didn't sell them to them. Those are Iranian missiles. All of it is provided by this additional money they got their hands on. They also conduct cyber attacks.

Here is the most dangerous part of the Iran deal. Yes, it dealt with uranium enrichment and supervision, but it did nothing with the missile system. To have a nuclear threat, you have to do three things; No. 1, have a bomb designed, which is the easiest part, believe it or not; No. 2, have the industrial capacity to enrich uranium to weapons grade, and that is just a function of time and willingness. Once you can enrich at any level, you can keep going. That is what the deal dealt with; and the third thing you have to do is deliver it. You have to launch it on something to reach your target.

The deal with Iran did nothing on the missiles. It gave them more money, and they used some of that money to build missiles that now have longer ranges. Where Iran, 5 or 10 years ago, had a more limited range of places to strike, today Iran can strike virtually every capital in the Middle East and every base in the region. That is where they were putting this money.

The Trump administration came in and said: Let me get this straight. We did a deal with Iran. They get a lot more money. They use that money to build better missiles, to sponsor terrorism, to conduct cyber attacks, and the only thing is they can't enrich uranium for a period of time until the deal goes away? That is not a bad deal for Iran because what they were banking on is that in 10 years, we would be focused on something else. The world would forget, and all of a sudden they would be able to enrich.

The deal was a fraud. It did nothing to make Iran less dangerous. The only thing the deal did is slow down their enrichment capability, but at no time are they less than 1½ to 2 years away to breaking out to weapons grade. At some point, they would—at least they retain that very option.

This idea that somehow Iran wasn't doing anything wrong but pulling out of the deal caused all these tensions is just not true. Even with a deal in place, Iran was arming and training and equipping all these groups in the region and conducting cyber attacks and building these missiles unabated. That is what was going on. Now they are feeling it.

By the way, today Iran is generating a lot less revenue than they were when the deal was in place. We are at a point now where even Hezbollah is out there openly saying they have had to cut back. They have budget cuts. They are putting out leaflets and things they posted publicly inside of Lebanon asking people to donate to Hezbollah because Iran can't donate as much as they used to. They have real fiscal constraints. That is not a bad thing. Likewise, with some of these Shia militias and others, it has constrained Iran's ability to operate.

Iran has decided the only way to reverse this is to force us back to some negotiation at some point to either, A, intimidate us back into the deal or, B, force us to the negotiating table to get something like it. How can they do that?

How can Iran position itself with some strength in order to get into that kind of negotiation? They can't sanction us economically. The only thing they can do is these terrorist attacks—these sort of attacks that started to connect. That is what they are in the pattern of doing.

Do you realize, last week, over a period of 7 days, every single day there was a Shia militia attack against a U.S. installation? Luckily, nobody died, but that was happening. That is what they were trying and are trying to do.

They were trying to position themselves and accumulate some strength so they can get into future negotiations from a position of strength. The only way they think they can do that is by threatening to attack us and, most interestingly, to attack us with some level of deniability. You have this tanker out there in the middle of the Gulf, which is a huge ocean, and suddenly some mines blow up, and you have journalists and politicians saying, how do we know it was Iran? Who was it? It wasn't the Swedes. It wasn't the Germans. It wasn't the French. It wasn't Luxembourg. There is only one organization in that part of the world with the capability to do what happened—Iran. Everybody knows it.

The only reason some countries don't admit it is because then they would have to do something about it. If you are a European country and you want the Iran deal to come back in place and you want to save it, you can't say you know Iran put those mines on those ships. If you say that, you have to pull out of the deal. That is why they wouldn't acknowledge it.

We have them on video. I heard people ask how we know those were Iranians. This is ridiculous stuff. By the way, the mines look identical to the ones Iran makes. So they did that. That was their plan, OK? Their plan was to attack us using other forces but to have some level of deniability. "It was not us."

They also know that there are divisions in American politics and that the President is unpopular in many countries. A lot of people around the world and in the United States would love nothing more than to say "Yes, how do we know it was Iran?" for different reasons. That is what they were banking on, but then they shot down an unmanned U.S. vehicle, and they admitted it because that would have been very difficult to deny. That is what really kicked off a lot of this argument that we are now hearing.

I want everybody to remember, if you go back 3 or 4 weeks, that there were people in the building and people on television—I saw them—commentators and others—who were basically implying that this was all not true, that there was no threat emanating from Iran, that it wasn't doing anything unusual. Now they are admitting that Iran is doing something unusual and dangerous, but 3 or 4 weeks ago, they were basically implying that this was all being made up by people who wanted a war.

Think that through logically. That means there would be dozens and dozens of career service men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces and in the Pentagon who would be, basically, lying to us about this. That is absurd.

So we get to the point of how this really got us here. It wasn't the deal with Iran or the pulling out of the deal that caused this. This has always been. This is what Iran has always done, and it has been doing it for two decades

now and longer. To somehow act as if Iran is more belligerent today than it was 6 months ago or 6 years ago is just not true. It is just that the threats have become more imminent directly against us.

When you look at this amendment, the amendment is basically designed to say that the President cannot enter into a war unless Congress approves it, which is an interesting dynamic.

No. 1, when you hear people saying you need authority from Congress, what they are talking about is the War Powers Resolution. In the aftermath of Vietnam and that era, Congress said, from now on, we are not getting into any more of these undeclared wars. If a President is going to commit service men and women for an extended period of time, it has to come through Congress.

No President—no administration—has ever accepted that resolution as being in the Constitution. From that point forward, every single administration—Democrat and Republican—has taken the position that this is an unconstitutional infringement on the power of the Commander in Chief. That has been the official position of every administration, Republican and Democrat, since that passed.

Nonetheless, on various occasions, Presidents have come to Congress for authority, which I think is a smart thing to do, especially for an extended engagement, because we are stronger and our policies are more effective when Congress and the American people are behind you. That is why President George W. Bush sought the authorization for Afghanistan and why he sought it for Iraq. It was the right thing to do, and it made sense. Yet no President has ever admitted that it is constitutional, and I share that view.

For a moment, let's assume that it were. Well, that resolution lays out three things that must happen before a President, a Commander in Chief, can commit U.S. forces to a hostility, to a war, to a fight.

The first thing is that there has to be a declaration of war. That is in the Constitution too. Congress can declare war.

The second is that Congress can authorize the use of force. That is when you hear all of this talk about the authorization for use of military force, the AUMF. That is what we had in Afghanistan, and that is what we had in Iraq. That is what a lot of people around here think we need if we are going to do something with Iraq.

There is a third component they like to ignore, and the third component is that a President can institute U.S. military action if Congress declares war, if Congress authorizes the use of force, or, No. 3, if there is an emergency that causes us to respond to an attack against the United States, our territories, our holdings, or our Armed Forces.

I want to tell you that if a Shia militia attacks a U.S. base in Iraq, this is

a pretty clear attack on the Armed Forces. If it shoots down one of our unmanned, unarmed platforms over international airspace, that is an attack on our Armed Forces. If they try to kidnap or murder an ambassador or a diplomat by attacking our Embassy, that is an attack on a U.S. territory since embassies are sovereign territories.

If you look at what the administration has done, the only thing the administration has done when it has come to the use of force is it has made sure that we have had enough ships and enough airplanes and enough personnel and enough assets in the Middle East so, if we are attacked, we can respond. That is the only thing it has done.

I don't know how you read the plain text of the language that they are wrapping themselves around—those who criticize what the administration has done—and not realize that it is fully authorized. If we are attacked, the President doesn't just have a right to respond—he has an obligation.

Think of the reverse. If the Iranians were to attack a facility in Iraq and murder 100 Americans who would be working at an embassy or diplomats or if they were to kill 200 soldiers, the first questions that every one of the President's critics would be asking on TV would be: Why didn't we have enough forces in the region to protect them? Why didn't we have a plan to save them? There would be congressional hearings, and there would be Members of Congress who would scream at the administration: Why didn't you have people there to save them?

In anticipating that this could happen, our military leaders, in their looking at the threats and understanding the environment, asked the administration to send additional forces so they may be prepared—to be in a position of having enough people and assets to respond in case of an attack.

I will go further than that.

Imagine the President is given verifiable information that an attack is imminent by Iran or one of its proxies and that the only way to save American lives is to wipe out the place from which it is going to launch the attack. Even if you acted first, that is self-defense. You are getting ahead of preventing an attack, not to mention the fact that the best way to respond to an attack is to prevent it from happening in the first place, and having a force posture in the region is one of the best ways to do that. That is the only thing that has been done here.

This amendment is just not necessary because, in assuming they are arguing that the War Powers Resolution makes pretty clear what Congress's power and role are in all of this, in the very text of that resolution, it makes clear that a President has a right to introduce military forces and to use military force to defend Americans, to defend America, and to defend our Armed Forces.

So why do we need language that says that a second time? Some would

say: Well, it is redundant, and it is already the law. Why not just vote for it again?

That is the final and, perhaps, the most important point in all of this—that the timing couldn't really be worse. It is not necessary, but the redundancy here is actually damaging, and here is why.

I think sometimes we make a terrible mistake in American politics. We ascribe our attributes to those of the leaders of other countries. When we hear that the President of Iran said something, we think Iran's President and his system is like ours. They are not. The President of Iran doesn't have one-tenth the power of our President, meaning there is a Supreme Leader, and everything goes to the Supreme Leader, a cleric. That is where the power really resides.

No. 2, we make a terrible mistake of believing that they truly understand us, our systems, and our debates when they don't, especially the Ayatollah. He is not a world traveler nor a constitutional expert nor a consumer of a varied amount of news and information from around the world nor a nuanced person who understands that this amendment, for example, is never going to become law.

Here is what they do believe, and I encourage all Members here to go out and inform themselves as to this. As a Senator, one has the opportunity to do it. They do believe that this President cannot respond. They believe that this President cannot and would not respond. They believe that there is a threshold—that there are x numbers of Americans they can kill and that there are certain types of attacks they can get away with without getting a response back. That is what they believe.

Why do they believe it?

No. 1, it is that our President has talked on various occasions about withdrawing all Americans from the region. So they begin by believing, by and large, that we don't even want to be there.

No. 2, they believe it because they look at our domestic politics, and they say: I have heard the debates, and I watched 5 minutes of CNN or some other network the other night, and I heard people on there who were from Congress or wherever who told the President he can't do this and can't do that. There is no support in America for responding, so the President is constrained in what he is able to do.

Why is that a problem?

It is because that is where you miscalculate. That is where what they think would trigger a response and what will actually trigger a response are two very different things.

If this thing were to pass—and I know there are still a couple of people who are thinking about voting for it—this would not be reported as an amendment that had passed on a bill but that was never going to become law because it was never going to get signed with that in there. That is not

how it would be reported. In fact, if there were a close vote on it, as I anticipate there will be, the way it would be reported would be as “even a handful of Republicans and virtually every Democrat voted to send the President a message of ‘we don’t want you using Armed Forces in wars against Iran.’” That is how it would be reported. That is how they would read it. It would only reinforce this belief among some in that regime that they can go further than they actually can.

I don’t mean to say this to argue that there are Members of this body here who are deliberately putting the men and women of our Armed Forces in danger. I am telling them I don’t know if they have thought through that part of it. What we do here and how it is perceived in other parts of the world, especially in a reclusive organization such as the regime in Iran, are often two very different things.

The danger with this amendment is that it is going to confirm to several hard-liners in that regime that the President is constrained, that America’s President will not be able to respond, and that they will be able to get away with more than they actually will get away with.

In some ways, ironically, I believe that even a big vote on this—but, certainly, the passage of it—increases the chance of war. I say that because, if they miscalculate and they read into this an opportunity to attack at a higher level without taking a retaliatory response, they are going to do it. Then they are going to be wrong, and then the retaliation will come. Then it is on. Then we can’t predict what will happen next.

What happens next is terrifying to even contemplate because what happens next could be a Hezbollah strike against Israel and Israel’s responding 10 times stronger. It could be Hezbollah’s moving to abduct, kill, murder American diplomats or personnel inside of Lebanon; it could be Shia militias throughout Iraq and Syria attacking U.S. personnel; it could be increased Houthi attacks not just into Saudi Arabia but potentially even hitting civilian populations and Saudi Arabia’s responding back. What could come next is a spiraling series of events that could lead to a dangerous regional war. That is not an exaggeration. Neither is it an exaggeration to believe that a miscalculation on the part of Iran and what it can get away with would trigger that.

This is an unnecessary amendment because, if you accept the War Powers Resolution as valid under our Constitution—I do not—it already reads that the President has a right to respond in self-defense. The administration has made it very clear that this is the only way it intends to use it. It has made it abundantly clear. In fact, its force posture proves it. If you look at what we have in the region—the number of ships and the number of people—we are not postured for an invasion or an all-

out war. We are postured for defensive operations and retaliatory strikes to an attack, and that is what the administration says it intends to do.

What it intends to do is to continue forward, strangling the sources of financing that the Iranian regime is using to sponsor terrorism and its ballistic missile program and having enough force in the region to protect our men and women who serve us if they were to come under attack. The President is allowed to do that in the Constitution and in the War Powers Resolution.

All this amendment does is create a dangerous opportunity to be misread and to cause Iran to do something, and that will trigger a response. Then we will have a war. For those who are considering still voting for this because they want to reassert Congress’s role, this is the wrong time and place in which to do it.

I will close with this. I don’t agree with all of the President’s foreign policy views. I can tell you, for example, that I do believe that openly talking about getting out of the Middle East as soon as possible has emboldened some of this thinking that America is constrained and that we really don’t have the dedication or the commitment to see this through if we are attacked. Yet, in fairness, this President is far less likely to get into a war or to start one than was his predecessor—or his two predecessors, actually. He showed great restraint the other day.

It strikes me that not only is this unnecessary from a policy perspective, it is also unnecessary from a personality perspective. This is not a President who is looking to start wars. This is a President who is looking to get out of the ones we are already in. Again, I just don’t know why we would run the risk of putting something out there that could be misconstrued and lead to an attack when we have a President who has no intention of starting a war, when we have a military posture in the region that would not support an offensive military operation or anything close to what Afghanistan or Iraq was like, and when we have this danger of miscalculation.

The amendment has been filed, and there will be a vote on it tomorrow. I just hope that the handful of people still thinking about it will consider all of these points.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### APPOINTMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwith-

standing the upcoming adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to Commissions, Committees, Boards, Conferences, or Interparliamentary Conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two houses, or by order of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXTENDING THE PROGRAM OF BLOCK GRANTS TO STATES FOR TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES AND RELATED PROGRAMS THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2940) to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through September 30, 2019.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 2940) was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROVIDING FOR A 2-WEEK EXTENSION OF THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2047, submitted today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2047) to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2047) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:  
S. 2047

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

**SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**

Section 223(d)(3) of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 1396a note) is amended by striking “June 30, 2019” and inserting “July 14, 2019”.

**SEC. 2. MEDICAID IMPROVEMENT FUND.**

Section 1941(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w-1(b)(1)) is amended by striking “\$6,000,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”.

**RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STONEWALL UPRISING**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 270, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 270) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall uprising.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 270) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

**COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 271, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 271) designating July 12, 2019, as “Collector Car Appreciation Day” and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States.

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. 271) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

**COLUMBIA RIVER IN-LIEU AND TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES IMPROVEMENT ACT**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 38, S. 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 50) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Hoeven amendment at the desk be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 904) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the authorization amount)

On page 3, line 23, strike “such sums as are necessary” and insert “\$11,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2025”.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 50), as amended, was passed as follows:

S. 50

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Columbia River In-Lieu and Treaty Fishing Access Sites Improvement Act”.

**SEC. 2. SANITATION AND SAFETY CONDITIONS AT CERTAIN BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS FACILITIES.**

(a) ASSESSMENT OF CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in consultation with the affected Columbia River Treaty tribes, may assess current sanitation and safety conditions on lands held by the United States for the benefit of the affected Columbia River Treaty tribes, including all permanent Federal structures and improvements

on those lands, that were set aside to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds—

(1) in accordance with the Act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 10, chapter 19) (commonly known as the “River and Harbor Act of 1945”); or

(2) in accordance with title IV of Public Law 100–581 (102 Stat. 2944).

(b) EXCLUSIVE AUTHORIZATION; CONTRACTS.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Indian Affairs—

(1) subject to paragraph (2)(B), shall be the only Federal agency authorized to carry out the activities described in this section; and

(2) may delegate the authority to carry out activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d)—

(A) through one or more contracts entered into with an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.); or

(B) to include other Federal agencies that have relevant expertise.

(c) DEFINITION OF AFFECTED COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY TRIBES.—In this section, the term “affected Columbia River Treaty tribes” means the Nez Perce Tribe, the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior \$11,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2025, to remain available until expended—

(1) for improvements to existing structures and infrastructure to improve sanitation and safety conditions assessed under subsection (a); and

(2) to improve access to electricity, sewer, and water infrastructure, where feasible, to reflect needs for sanitary and safe use of facilities referred to in subsection (a).

**SEC. 3. STUDY OF ASSESSMENT AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES.**

The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, shall—

(1) conduct a study to evaluate whether the sanitation and safety conditions on lands held by the United States for the benefit of the affected Columbia River Treaty tribes (as defined in section 2(c)) have improved as a result of the activities authorized in section 2; and

(2) prepare and submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of that study.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**INDIAN COMMUNITY ECONOMIC ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2019**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 63, S. 212.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 212) to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs



Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Hoeven amendment at the desk be agreed to and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 905) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the Indian Economic Development Feasibility Study)

On page 12, line 16, insert “the extent to which the programs and services overlap or are duplicative,” after “development.”

The bill 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, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the bill?

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 212), as amended, was passed as follows:

S. 212

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Indian Community Economic Enhancement Act of 2019”.

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1)(A) to bring industry and economic development to Indian communities, Indian Tribes must overcome a number of barriers, including—

- (i) geographical location;
- (ii) lack of infrastructure or capacity;
- (iii) lack of sufficient collateral and capital; and
- (iv) regulatory bureaucracy relating to—
  - (I) development; and
  - (II) access to services provided by the Federal Government; and

(B) the barriers described in subparagraph (A) often add to the cost of doing business in Indian communities;

(2) Indian Tribes—

- (A) enact laws and exercise sovereign governmental powers;
- (B) determine policy for the benefit of Tribal members; and
- (C) produce goods and services for consumers;

(3) the Federal Government has—

- (A) an important government-to-government relationship with Indian Tribes; and
- (B) a role in facilitating healthy and sustainable Tribal economies;

(4) the input of Indian Tribes in developing Federal policy and programs leads to more meaningful and effective measures to assist Indian Tribes and Indian entrepreneurs in building Tribal economies;

(5)(A) many components of Tribal infrastructure need significant repair or replacement; and

(B) access to private capital for projects in Indian communities—

- (i) may not be available; or
- (ii) may come at a higher cost than such access for other projects;

(6)(A) Federal capital improvement programs, such as those that facilitate tax-ex-

empt bond financing and loan guarantees, are tools that help improve or replace crumbling infrastructure;

(B) lack of parity in treatment of an Indian Tribe as a governmental entity under Federal tax and certain other regulatory laws impedes, in part, the ability of Indian Tribes to raise capital through issuance of tax exempt debt, invest as an accredited investor, and benefit from other investment incentives accorded to State and local governmental entities; and

(C) as a result of the disparity in treatment of Indian Tribes described in subparagraph (B), investors may avoid financing, or demand a premium to finance, projects in Indian communities, making the projects more costly or inaccessible;

(7) there are a number of Federal loan guarantee programs available to facilitate financing of business, energy, economic, housing, and community development projects in Indian communities, and those programs may support public-private partnerships for infrastructure development, but improvements and support are needed for those programs specific to Indian communities to facilitate more effectively private financing for infrastructure and other urgent development needs; and

(8)(A) most real property held by Indian Tribes is trust or restricted land that essentially cannot be held as collateral; and

(B) while creative solutions, such as leasehold mortgages, have been developed in response to the problem identified in subparagraph (A), some solutions remain subject to review and approval by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, adding additional costs and delay to Tribal projects.

#### SEC. 3. NATIVE AMERICAN BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT, TRADE PROMOTION, AND TOURISM ACT OF 2000.

(a) FINDINGS; PURPOSES.—Section 2 of the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4301) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) APPLICABILITY TO INDIAN-OWNED BUSINESSES.—The findings and purposes in subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to any Indian-owned business governed—

“(1) by Tribal laws regulating trade or commerce on Indian lands; or

“(2) pursuant to section 5 of the Act of August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. 200, chapter 289; 25 U.S.C. 261).”

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4302) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (6) and paragraphs (7) through (9), as paragraphs (2) through (7) and paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) the following:

“(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of Native American Business Development appointed pursuant to section 4(a)(2).”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) the following:

“(8) OFFICE.—The term ‘Office’ means the Office of Native American Business Development established by section 4(a)(1).”

(c) OFFICE OF NATIVE AMERICAN BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT.—Section 4 of the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4303) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “Department of Commerce” and inserting “Office of the Secretary”; and

(ii) by striking “(referred to in this Act as the ‘Office’)”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), in the first sentence, by striking “(referred to in this Act as the ‘Director’)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) DUTIES OF DIRECTOR.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall serve as—

“(A) the program and policy advisor to the Secretary with respect to the trust and governmental relationship between the United States and Indian Tribes; and

“(B) the point of contact for Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, and Indians regarding—

“(i) policies and programs of the Department of Commerce; and

“(ii) other matters relating to economic development and doing business in Indian lands.

“(2) DEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION.—The Director shall coordinate with all offices and agencies within the Department of Commerce to ensure that each office and agency has an accountable process to ensure—

“(A) meaningful and timely coordination and assistance, as required by this Act; and

“(B) consultation with Indian Tribes regarding the policies, programs, assistance, and activities of the offices and agencies.

“(3) OFFICE OPERATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not more than \$2,000,000 for each fiscal year.”

(d) INDIAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES.—The Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 8 (25 U.S.C. 4307) as section 10; and

(2) by inserting after section 7 (25 U.S.C. 4306) the following:

“SEC. 8. INDIAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES.

“(a) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—Not later than 1 year after the enactment of this section, the Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall coordinate—

“(1) to develop initiatives that—

“(A) encourage, promote, and provide education regarding investments in Indian communities through—

“(i) the loan guarantee program of Bureau of Indian Affairs under section 201 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1481);

“(ii) programs carried out using amounts in the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund established under section 104(a) of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4703(a)); and

“(iii) other capital development programs;

“(B) examine and develop alternatives that would qualify as collateral for financing in Indian communities; and

“(C) provide entrepreneur and other training relating to economic development through tribally controlled colleges and universities and other Indian organizations with experience in providing such training;

“(2) to consult with Indian Tribes and with the Securities and Exchange Commission to study, and collaborate to establish, regulatory changes necessary to qualify an Indian Tribe as an accredited investor for the purposes of sections 230.500 through 230.508 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), consistent with the goals of promoting capital formation and ensuring qualifying Indian Tribes have the ability to withstand investment loss, on a basis comparable to other legal entities that qualify as accredited investors who are not natural persons;

“(3) to identify regulatory, legal, or other barriers to increasing investment, business, and economic development, including qualifying or approving collateral structures,

measurements of economic strength, and contributions of Indian economies in Indian communities through the Authority established under section 4 of the Indian Tribal Regulatory Reform and Business Development Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4301 note);

“(4) to ensure consultation with Indian Tribes regarding increasing investment in Indian communities and the development of the report required in paragraph (5); and

“(5) not less than once every 2 years, to provide a report to Congress regarding—

“(A) improvements to Indian communities resulting from such initiatives and recommendations for promoting sustained growth of the Tribal economies;

“(B) results of the study and collaboration regarding the necessary changes referenced in paragraph (2) and the impact of allowing Indian Tribes to qualify as an accredited investor; and

“(C) the identified regulatory, legal, and other barriers referenced in paragraph (3).

“(b) WAIVER.—For assistance provided pursuant to section 108 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4707) to benefit Native Community Development Financial Institutions, as defined by the Secretary of the Treasury, section 108(e) of such Act shall not apply.

“(c) INDIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY STUDY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Government Accountability Office shall conduct a study and, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the study and recommendations.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The study shall include an assessment of each of the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The study shall assess current Federal capitalization and related programs and services that are available to assist Indian communities with business and economic development, including manufacturing, physical infrastructure (such as telecommunications and broadband), community development, and facilities construction for such purposes. For each of the Federal programs and services identified, the study shall assess the current use and demand by Indian Tribes, individuals, businesses, and communities of the programs, the capital needs of Indian Tribes, businesses, and communities related to economic development, the extent to which the programs and services overlap or are duplicative, and the extent that similar programs have been used to assist non-Indian communities compared to the extent used for Indian communities.

“(B) FINANCING ASSISTANCE.—The study shall assess and quantify the extent of assistance provided to non-Indian borrowers and to Indian (both Tribal and individual) borrowers (including information about such assistance as a percentage of need for Indian borrowers and for non-Indian borrowers, assistance to Indian borrowers and to non-Indian borrowers as a percentage of total applicants, and such assistance to Indian borrowers as individuals as compared to such assistance to Indian Tribes) through the loan programs, the loan guarantee programs, or bond guarantee programs of the—

“(i) Department of the Interior;

“(ii) Department of Agriculture;

“(iii) Department of Housing and Urban Development;

“(iv) Department of Energy;

“(v) Small Business Administration; and

“(vi) Community Development Financial Institutions Fund of the Department of the Treasury.

“(C) TAX INCENTIVES.—The study shall assess and quantify the extent of the assistance and allocations afforded for non-Indian projects and for Indian projects pursuant to each of the following tax incentive programs:

“(i) New market tax credit.

“(ii) Low income housing tax credit.

“(iii) Investment tax credit.

“(iv) Renewable energy tax incentives.

“(v) Accelerated depreciation.

“(D) TRIBAL INVESTMENT INCENTIVE.—The study shall assess various alternative incentives that could be provided to enable and encourage Tribal governments to invest in an Indian community development investment fund or bank.”.

(e) CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3—

(A) in each of paragraphs (1), (4), and (8), by striking “tribe” and inserting “Tribe”; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking “The term ‘Indian tribe’ has the meaning given that term” and inserting “The term ‘Indian Tribe’ has the meaning given the term ‘Indian tribe’”;

(2) by striking “tribes” each place the term appears and inserting “Tribes”; and

(3) by striking “tribal” each place the term appears and inserting “Tribal”.

**SEC. 4. BUY INDIAN ACT.**

Section 23 of the Act of June 25, 1910 (commonly known as the “Buy Indian Act”) (36 Stat. 861, chapter 431; 25 U.S.C. 47), is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 23. EMPLOYMENT OF INDIAN LABOR AND PURCHASE OF PRODUCTS OF INDIAN INDUSTRY; PARTICIPATION IN MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) INDIAN ECONOMIC ENTERPRISE.—The term ‘Indian economic enterprise’ has the meaning given the term in section 1480.201 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

“(2) MENTOR FIRM; PROTEGE FIRM.—The terms ‘mentor firm’ and ‘protege firm’ have the meanings given those terms in section 831(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note; Public Law 101-510).

“(3) SECRETARIES.—The term ‘Secretaries’ means—

“(A) the Secretary of the Interior; and

“(B) the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(b) ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless determined by one of the Secretaries to be impracticable and unreasonable—

“(A) Indian labor shall be employed; and

“(B) purchases of Indian industry products (including printing and facilities construction, notwithstanding any other provision of law) may be made in open market by the Secretaries.

“(2) MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Participation in the Mentor-Protege Program established under section 831(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note; Public Law 101-510) or receipt of assistance under a developmental assistance agreement under that program shall not render any individual or entity involved in the provision of Indian labor or an Indian industry product ineligible to receive assistance under this section.

“(B) TREATMENT.—For purposes of this section, no determination of affiliation or control (whether direct or indirect) may be found between a protege firm and a mentor firm on the basis that the mentor firm has provided, or agreed to provide, to the protege

firm, pursuant to a mentor-protege agreement, any form of developmental assistance described in section 831(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note; Public Law 101-510).

“(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretaries shall—

“(1) conduct outreach to Indian industrial entities;

“(2) provide training;

“(3) promulgate regulations in accordance with this section and with the regulations under part 1480 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), to harmonize the procurement procedures of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Health and Human Services, to the maximum extent practicable;

“(4) require regional offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service to aggregate data regarding compliance with this section;

“(5) require procurement management reviews by their respective Departments to include a review of the implementation of this section; and

“(6) consult with Indian Tribes, Indian industrial entities, and other stakeholders regarding methods to facilitate compliance with—

“(A) this section; and

“(B) other small business or procurement goals.

“(d) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, each of the Secretaries shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing, during the period covered by the report, the implementation of this section by each of the respective Secretaries.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each report under this subsection shall include, for each fiscal year during the period covered by the report—

“(A) the names of each agency under the respective jurisdiction of each of the Secretaries to which this section has been applied, and efforts made by additional agencies within the Secretaries’ respective Departments to use the procurement procedures under this Act;

“(B) a summary of the types of purchases made from, and contracts (including any relevant modifications, extensions, or renewals) awarded to, Indian economic enterprises, expressed by agency region;

“(C) a description of the percentage increase or decrease in total dollar value and number of purchases and awards made within each agency region, as compared to the totals of the region for the preceding fiscal year;

“(D) a description of the methods used by applicable contracting officers and employees to conduct market searches to identify qualified Indian economic enterprises;

“(E) a summary of all deviations granted under section 1480.403 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), including a description of—

“(i) the types of alternative procurement methods used, including any Indian owned businesses reported under other procurement goals; and

“(ii) the dollar value of any awards made pursuant to those deviations;

“(F) a summary of all determinations made to provide awards to Indian economic enterprises, including a description of the dollar value of the awards;

“(G) a description or summary of the total number and value of all purchases of, and contracts awarded for, supplies, services, and

construction (including the percentage increase or decrease, as compared to the preceding fiscal year) from—

“(i) Indian economic enterprises; and  
“(ii) non-Indian economic enterprises;  
“(H) any administrative, procedural, legal, or other barriers to achieving the purposes of this section, together with recommendations for legislative or administrative actions to address those barriers; and  
“(I) for each agency region—

“(i) the total amount spent on purchases made from, and contracts awarded to, Indian economic enterprises; and

“(ii) a comparison of the amount described in clause (i) to the total amount that the agency region would likely have spent on the same purchases made from a non-Indian economic enterprise or contracts awarded to a non-Indian economic enterprise.

“(e) GOALS.—Each agency shall establish an annual minimum percentage goal for procurement in compliance with this section.”.

#### SEC. 5. NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS ACT OF 1974.

(a) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR NATIVE AMERICAN PROJECTS.—Section 803 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991b) is amended—

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

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner may provide assistance under subsection (a) for projects relating to the purposes of this title to a Native community development financial institution, as defined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(2) PRIORITY.—With regard to not less than 50 percent of the total amount available for assistance under this section, the Commissioner shall give priority to any application seeking assistance for—

“(A) the development of a Tribal code or court system for purposes of economic development, including commercial codes, training for court personnel, regulation pursuant to section 5 of the Act of August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. 200, chapter 289; 25 U.S.C. 261), and the development of nonprofit subsidiaries or other Tribal business structures;

“(B) the development of a community development financial institution, including training and administrative expenses; or

“(C) the development of a Tribal master plan for community and economic development and infrastructure.”.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—Section 804 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991c) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “The Commissioner” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) PRIORITY.—In providing assistance under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall give priority to any application described in section 803(b)(2).”.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 816 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d) is amended—

(1) by striking “803(d)” each place it appears and inserting “803(e)”; and

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “such sums as may be necessary” and inserting “\$34,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

(d) CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking “tribe” each place the term appears and inserting “Tribe”;

(2) by striking “tribes” each place the term appears and inserting “Tribes”; and

(3) by striking “tribal” each place the term appears and inserting “Tribal”.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following Calendar items, en bloc: Calendar Nos. 110, 41, 73, 42, 64, 49, 34, 37, and 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills, en bloc.

#### NULLIFYING THE SUPPLEMENTAL TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE CONFEDERATED TRIBES AND BANDS OF INDIANS OF MIDDLE OREGON

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 832) to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865.

#### PROVIDING FOR THE CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE TANANA TRIBAL COUNCIL LOCATED IN TANANA, ALASKA, AND TO THE BRISTOL BAY AREA HEALTH CORPORATION LOCATED IN DILLINGHAM, ALASKA

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 224) to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska, and to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska, and for other purposes.

#### PROGRESS FOR INDIAN TRIBES ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 209) to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

#### ESTHER MARTINEZ NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES PROGRAMS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 256) to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages.

#### NATIVE AMERICAN BUSINESS INCUBATORS PROGRAM ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 294) to establish a business incubators program within the Department of

the Interior to promote economic development in Indian reservation communities.

#### TRIBAL HUD-VASH ACT OF 2019

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 257) to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans, and for other purposes.

#### SPOKANE TRIBE OF INDIANS OF THE SPOKANE RESERVATION EQUITABLE COMPENSATION ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 216) to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes.

#### KLAMATH TRIBE JUDGMENT FUND REPEAL ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 46) to repeal the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act.

#### LEECH LAKE BAND OF OJIBWE RESERVATION RESTORATION ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 199) to provide for the transfer of certain Federal land in the State of Minnesota for the benefit of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bills, en bloc, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bills were ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and were read the third time, en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bills, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bills having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bills pass, en bloc?

The bills (S. 832, S. 224, S. 209, S. 256, S. 294, S. 257, S. 216, S. 46, S. 199) were passed, en bloc, as follows:

S. 832

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

#### SECTION 1. NULLIFICATION OF TREATY.

The Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865, and entered into pursuant to the Senate resolution of ratification dated March 2, 1867 (14 Stat. 751), shall have no force or effect.

S. 224

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

#### SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO THE TANANA TRIBAL COUNCIL.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable, but not later than 180 days, after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in

this Act as the “Secretary”) shall convey to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska (referred to in this section as the “Council”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in subsection (b) for use in connection with health and social services programs.

(2) EFFECT ON ANY QUITCLAIM DEED.—The conveyance by the Secretary of title by warranty deed under this subsection shall, on the effective date of the conveyance, supersede and render of no future effect any quitclaim deed to the property described in subsection (b) executed by the Secretary and the Council.

(3) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance of the property under this section—

(A) shall be made by warranty deed; and

(B) shall not—

(i) require any consideration from the Council for the property;

(ii) impose any obligation, term, or condition on the Council; or

(iii) allow for any reversionary interest of the United States in the property.

(b) PROPERTY DESCRIBED.—The property, including all land, improvements, and appurtenances, described in this subsection is the property included in U.S. Survey No. 5958, Lot 12, in the village of Tanana, Alaska, within surveyed Township 4N, Range 22W, Fairbanks Meridian, Alaska, containing 11.25 acres.

(c) ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY.—

(1) LIABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Council shall not be liable for any soil, surface water, groundwater, or other contamination resulting from the disposal, release, or presence of any environmental contamination on any portion of the property described in subsection (b) on or before the date on which the property is conveyed to the Council.

(B) ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION.—An environmental contamination described in subparagraph (A) includes any oil or petroleum products, hazardous substances, hazardous materials, hazardous waste, pollutants, toxic substances, solid waste, or any other environmental contamination or hazard as defined in any Federal or State of Alaska law.

(2) EASEMENT.—The Secretary shall be accorded any easement or access to the property conveyed under this section as may be reasonably necessary to satisfy any retained obligation or liability of the Secretary.

(3) NOTICE OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE ACTIVITY AND WARRANTY.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall comply with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)).

## SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO THE BRISTOL BAY AREA HEALTH CORPORATION.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable, but not later than 180 days, after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska (referred to in this section as the “Corporation”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in subsection (b) for use in connection with health and social services programs.

(2) EFFECT ON ANY QUITCLAIM DEED.—The conveyance by the Secretary of title by warranty deed under this subsection shall, on the effective date of the conveyance, supersede and render of no future effect any quitclaim deed to the property described in sub-

section (b) executed by the Secretary and the Corporation.

(3) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance of the property under this section—

(A) shall be made by warranty deed; and

(B) shall not—

(i) require any consideration from the Corporation for the property;

(ii) impose any obligation, term, or condition on the Corporation; or

(iii) allow for any reversionary interest of the United States in the property.

(b) PROPERTY DESCRIBED.—The property, including all land, improvements, and appurtenances, described in this subsection is the property included in Dental Annex Subdivision, creating tract 1, a subdivision of Lot 2 of U.S. Survey No. 2013, located in Section 36, Township 13 South, Range 56 West, Seward Meridian, Bristol Bay Recording District, Dillingham, Alaska, according to Plat No. 2015-8, recorded on May 28, 2015, in the Bristol Bay Recording District, Dillingham, Alaska, containing 1.474 acres more or less.

(c) ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY.—

(1) LIABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Corporation shall not be liable for any soil, surface water, groundwater, or other contamination resulting from the disposal, release, or presence of any environmental contamination on any portion of the property described in subsection (b) on or before the date on which the property is conveyed to the Corporation.

(B) ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION.—An environmental contamination described in subparagraph (A) includes any oil or petroleum products, hazardous substances, hazardous materials, hazardous waste, pollutants, toxic substances, solid waste, or any other environmental contamination or hazard as defined in any Federal or State of Alaska law.

(2) EASEMENT.—The Secretary shall be accorded any easement or access to the property conveyed under this section as may be reasonably necessary to satisfy any retained obligation or liability of the Secretary.

(3) NOTICE OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE ACTIVITY AND WARRANTY.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall comply with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)).

S. 209

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

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Practical Reforms and Other Goals To Reinforce the Effectiveness of Self-Governance and Self-Determination for Indian Tribes Act of 2019” or the “PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

#### TITLE I—TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE

Sec. 101. Tribal self-governance.

#### TITLE II—INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION

Sec. 201. Definitions; reporting and audit requirements; application of provisions.

Sec. 202. Contracts by Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 203. Administrative provisions.

Sec. 204. Contract funding and indirect costs.

Sec. 205. Contract or grant specifications.

#### TITLE I—TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE

##### SEC. 101. TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE.

(a) EFFECT OF PROVISIONS.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed—

(1) to modify, limit, expand, or otherwise affect—

(A) the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, as provided for under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act), regarding—

(i) the inclusion of any non-BIA program (as defined in section 401 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act) in a self-determination contract or funding agreement under section 403(c) of such Act (as so in effect); or

(ii) the implementation of any contract or agreement described in clause (i) that is in effect on the day described in subparagraph (A);

(B) the meaning, application, or effect of any Tribal water rights settlement, including the performance required of a party thereto or any payment or funding obligation thereunder;

(C) the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of a State to manage, control, or regulate fish and wildlife under State law (including regulations) on land or water in the State, including Federal public land;

(D) except for the authority provided to the Secretary as described in subparagraph (A), the applicability or effect of any Federal law related to the protection or management of fish or wildlife; or

(E) any treaty-reserved right or other right of any Indian Tribe as recognized by any other means, including treaties or agreements with the United States, Executive orders, statutes, regulations, or case law; or

(2) to authorize any provision of a contract or agreement that is not consistent with the terms of a Tribal water rights settlement.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 401 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5361) is amended to read as follows:

#### “SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) COMPACT.—The term ‘compact’ means a self-governance compact entered into under section 404.

“(2) CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM; CONSTRUCTION PROJECT.—The term ‘construction program’ or ‘construction project’ means a Tribal undertaking relating to the administration, planning, environmental determination, design, construction, repair, improvement, or expansion of roads, bridges, buildings, structures, systems, or other facilities for purposes of housing, law enforcement, detention, sanitation, water supply, education, administration, community, health, irrigation, agriculture, conservation, flood control, transportation, or port facilities, or for other Tribal purposes.

“(3) DEPARTMENT.—The term ‘Department’ means the Department of the Interior.

“(4) FUNDING AGREEMENT.—The term ‘funding agreement’ means a funding agreement entered into under section 403.

“(5) GROSS MISMANAGEMENT.—The term ‘gross mismanagement’ means a significant violation, shown by a preponderance of the evidence, of a compact, funding agreement, or statutory or regulatory requirement applicable to Federal funds for a program administered by an Indian Tribe under a compact or funding agreement.

“(6) INHERENT FEDERAL FUNCTION.—The term ‘inherent Federal function’ means a Federal function that may not legally be delegated to an Indian Tribe.

“(7) NON-BIA PROGRAM.—The term ‘non-BIA program’ means all or a portion of a program, function, service, or activity that is administered by any bureau, service, office, or agency of the Department of the Interior other than—

“(A) the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

“(B) the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs; or

“(C) the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians.

“(8) PROGRAM.—The term ‘program’ means any program, function, service, or activity (or portion thereof) within the Department that is included in a funding agreement.

“(9) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of the Interior.

“(10) SELF-DETERMINATION CONTRACT.—The term ‘self-determination contract’ means a self-determination contract entered into under section 102.

“(11) SELF-GOVERNANCE.—The term ‘self-governance’ means the Tribal Self-Governance Program established under section 402.

“(12) TRIBAL SHARE.—The term ‘tribal share’ means the portion of all funds and resources of an Indian Tribe that—

“(A) support any program within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians, or the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs; and

“(B) are not required by the Secretary for the performance of an inherent Federal function.

“(13) TRIBAL WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT.—The term ‘tribal water rights settlement’ means any settlement, compact, or other agreement expressly ratified or approved by an Act of Congress that—

“(A) includes an Indian Tribe and the United States as parties; and

“(B) quantifies or otherwise defines any water right of the Indian Tribe.”

(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 402 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5362) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 402. TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE PROGRAM.**

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a program within the Department to be known as the ‘Tribal Self-Governance Program’.

“(b) SELECTION OF PARTICIPATING INDIAN TRIBES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Office of Self-Governance, may select not more than 50 new Indian Tribes per year from those tribes eligible under subsection (c) to participate in self-governance.

“(B) JOINT PARTICIPATION.—On the request of each participating Indian Tribe, 2 or more otherwise eligible Indian Tribes may be treated as a single Indian Tribe for the purpose of participating in self-governance.

“(2) OTHER AUTHORIZED INDIAN TRIBE OR TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—If an Indian Tribe authorizes another Indian Tribe or a Tribal organization to plan for or carry out a program on its behalf under this title, the authorized Indian Tribe or Tribal organization shall have the rights and responsibilities of the authorizing Indian Tribe (except as otherwise provided in the authorizing resolution).

“(3) JOINT PARTICIPATION AS ORGANIZATION.—Two or more Indian Tribes that are not otherwise eligible under subsection (c) may be treated as a single Indian Tribe for the purpose of participating in self-governance as a Tribal organization if—

“(A) each Indian Tribe so requests; and

“(B) the Tribal organization itself, or at least one of the Indian Tribes participating in the Tribal organization, is eligible under subsection (c).

“(4) TRIBAL WITHDRAWAL FROM A TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe that withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization, in whole or in part, shall be entitled to participate in self-governance if the Indian Tribe is eligible under subsection (c).

“(B) EFFECT OF WITHDRAWAL.—If an Indian Tribe withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization, the Indian Tribe shall be entitled to its Tribal share of funds and resources supporting the programs that the Indian Tribe is entitled to carry out under the compact and funding agreement of the Indian Tribe.

“(C) PARTICIPATION IN SELF-GOVERNANCE.—The withdrawal of an Indian Tribe from a Tribal organization shall not affect the eligibility of the Tribal organization to participate in self-governance on behalf of one or more other Indian Tribes, if the Tribal organization still qualifies under subsection (c).

“(D) WITHDRAWAL PROCESS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe may, by Tribal resolution, fully or partially withdraw its Tribal share of any program in a funding agreement from a participating Tribal organization.

“(ii) NOTIFICATION.—The Indian Tribe shall provide a copy of the Tribal resolution described in clause (i) to the Secretary.

“(iii) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A withdrawal under clause (i) shall become effective on the date that is specified in the Tribal resolution and mutually agreed upon by the Secretary, the withdrawing Indian Tribe, and the Tribal organization that signed the compact and funding agreement on behalf of the withdrawing Indian Tribe or Tribal organization.

“(II) NO SPECIFIED DATE.—In the absence of a date specified in the resolution, the withdrawal shall become effective on—

“(aa) the earlier of—

“(AA) 1 year after the date of submission of the request; and

“(BB) the date on which the funding agreement expires; or

“(bb) such date as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary, the withdrawing Indian Tribe, and the Tribal organization that signed the compact and funding agreement on behalf of the withdrawing Indian Tribe or Tribal organization.

“(E) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—If an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization eligible to enter into a self-determination contract or a compact or funding agreement fully or partially withdraws from a participating Tribal organization, the withdrawing Indian Tribe—

“(i) may elect to enter into a self-determination contract or compact, in which case—

“(I) the withdrawing Indian Tribe or Tribal organization shall be entitled to its Tribal share of unexpended funds and resources supporting the programs that the Indian Tribe will be carrying out under its own self-determination contract or compact and funding agreement (calculated on the same basis as the funds were initially allocated to the funding agreement of the Tribal organization); and

“(II) the funds referred to in subclause (I) shall be withdrawn by the Secretary from the funding agreement of the Tribal organization and transferred to the withdrawing Indian Tribe, on the condition that sections 102 and 105(i), as appropriate, shall apply to the withdrawing Indian Tribe; or

“(ii) may elect not to enter into a self-determination contract or compact, in which case all unexpended funds and resources associated with the withdrawing Indian Tribe’s returned programs (calculated on the same basis as the funds were initially allocated to the funding agreement of the Tribal organization) shall be returned by the Tribal organization to the Secretary for operation of the programs included in the withdrawal.

“(F) RETURN TO MATURE CONTRACT STATUS.—If an Indian Tribe elects to operate all or some programs carried out under a compact or funding agreement under this title through a self-determination contract under

title I, at the option of the Indian Tribe, the resulting self-determination contract shall be a mature self-determination contract as long as the Indian Tribe meets the requirements set forth in section 4(h).

“(c) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to participate in self-governance, an Indian Tribe shall—

“(1) successfully complete the planning phase described in subsection (d);

“(2) request participation in self-governance by resolution or other official action by the Tribal governing body; and

“(3) demonstrate, for the 3 fiscal years preceding the date on which the Indian Tribe requests participation, financial stability and financial management capability as evidenced by the Indian Tribe having no uncorrected significant and material audit exceptions in the required annual audit of its self-determination or self-governance agreements with any Federal agency.

“(d) PLANNING PHASE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe seeking to begin participation in self-governance shall complete a planning phase as provided in this subsection.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—The planning phase shall—

“(A) be conducted to the satisfaction of the Indian Tribe; and

“(B) include—

“(i) legal and budgetary research; and

“(ii) internal Tribal government planning, training, and organizational preparation.

“(e) GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization that meets the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c) shall be eligible for grants—

“(A) to plan for participation in self-governance; and

“(B) to negotiate the terms of participation by the Indian Tribe or Tribal organization in self-governance, as set forth in a compact and a funding agreement.

“(2) RECEIPT OF GRANT NOT REQUIRED.—Receipt of a grant under paragraph (1) shall not be a requirement of participation in self-governance.”

(d) FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—Section 403 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5363) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary shall, on the request of any Indian Tribe or Tribal organization, negotiate and enter into a written funding agreement with the governing body of the Indian Tribe or the Tribal organization in a manner consistent with—

“(1) the trust responsibility of the Federal Government, treaty obligations, and the government-to-government relationship between Indian Tribes and the United States; and

“(2) subsection (b).”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “without regard to the agency or office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs” and inserting “the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, and the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians, without regard to the agency or office of that Bureau or those Offices”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting the margins of such clauses accordingly;

(iii) by striking “including any program” and inserting the following: “including—

“(A) any program”;

(iv) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i), as redesignated by clause (ii), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “; and”;

(II) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(v) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B);

(vi) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by clause (v), by striking the semicolon and inserting “; and”;

(vii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) any other program, service, function, or activity (or portion thereof) that is provided through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, or the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians with respect to which Indian Tribes or Indians are primary or significant beneficiaries;”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “section 405(c)” and inserting “section 412(c)”;

(ii) by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(D) by striking paragraphs (4) through (9);

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “FOR REVIEW”;

(B) by striking “such agreement to—” and all that follows through “Indian tribe” and inserting “such agreement to each Indian Tribe”;

(C) by striking “agreement;” and inserting “agreement.”;

(D) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3);

(4) in subsection (k), by striking “section 405(c)(1)” and inserting “section 412(c)”;

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(m) OTHER PROVISIONS.—

“(1) EXCLUDED FUNDING.—A funding agreement shall not authorize an Indian Tribe to plan, conduct, administer, or receive Tribal share funding under any program that—

“(A) is provided under the Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities Assistance Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.); or

“(B) is provided for elementary and secondary schools under the formula developed under section 1127 of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2007).

“(2) SERVICES, FUNCTIONS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—A funding agreement shall specify—

“(A) the services to be provided under the funding agreement;

“(B) the functions to be performed under the funding agreement; and

“(C) the responsibilities of the Indian Tribe and the Secretary under the funding agreement.

“(3) BASE BUDGET.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A funding agreement shall, at the option of the Indian Tribe, provide for a stable base budget specifying the recurring funds (which may include funds available under section 106(a)) to be transferred to the Indian Tribe, for such period as the Indian Tribe specifies in the funding agreement, subject to annual adjustment only to reflect changes in congressional appropriations.

“(B) LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a funding agreement shall not specify funding associated with a program described in subsection (b)(2) or (c) unless the Secretary agrees.

“(4) NO WAIVER OF TRUST RESPONSIBILITY.—A funding agreement shall prohibit the Secretary from waiving, modifying, or diminishing in any way the trust responsibility of the United States with respect to Indian Tribes and individual Indians that exists under treaties, Executive orders, court decisions, and other laws.

“(n) AMENDMENT.—The Secretary shall not revise, amend, or require additional terms in a new or subsequent funding agreement

without the consent of the Indian Tribe, unless such terms are required by Federal law.

“(o) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A funding agreement shall become effective on the date specified in the funding agreement.

“(p) EXISTING AND SUBSEQUENT FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) SUBSEQUENT FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—Absent notification from an Indian Tribe that the Indian Tribe is withdrawing or retroceding the operation of one or more programs identified in a funding agreement, or unless otherwise agreed to by the parties to the funding agreement or by the nature of any noncontinuing program, service, function, or activity contained in a funding agreement—

“(A) a funding agreement shall remain in full force and effect until a subsequent funding agreement is executed, with funding paid annually for each fiscal year the agreement is in effect; and

“(B) the term of the subsequent funding agreement shall be retroactive to the end of the term of the preceding funding agreement for the purposes of calculating the amount of funding to which the Indian Tribe is entitled.

“(2) DISPUTES.—Disputes over the implementation of paragraph (1)(A) shall be subject to section 406(c).

“(3) EXISTING FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—An Indian Tribe that was participating in self-governance under this title on the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act shall have the option at any time after that date—

“(A) to retain its existing funding agreement (in whole or in part) to the extent that the provisions of that funding agreement are not directly contrary to any express provision of this title; or

“(B) to negotiate a new funding agreement in a manner consistent with this title.

“(4) MULTIYEAR FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—An Indian Tribe may, at the discretion of the Indian Tribe, negotiate with the Secretary for a funding agreement with a term that exceeds 1 year.”.

(e) GENERAL REVISIONS.—Title IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5361 et seq.) is amended by striking sections 404 through 408 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 404. COMPACTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall negotiate and enter into a written compact with each Indian Tribe participating in self-governance in a manner consistent with the trust responsibility of the Federal Government, treaty obligations, and the government-to-government relationship between Indian Tribes and the United States.

“(b) CONTENTS.—A compact under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) specify and affirm the general terms of the government-to-government relationship between the Indian Tribe and the Secretary; and

“(2) include such terms as the parties intend shall control during the term of the compact.

“(c) AMENDMENT.—A compact under subsection (a) may be amended only by agreement of the parties.

“(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The effective date of a compact under subsection (a) shall be—

“(1) the date of the execution of the compact by the parties; or

“(2) such date as is mutually agreed upon by the parties.

“(e) DURATION.—A compact under subsection (a) shall remain in effect—

“(1) for so long as permitted by Federal law; or

“(2) until termination by written agreement, retrocession, or reassumption.

“(f) EXISTING COMPACTS.—An Indian Tribe participating in self-governance under this

title, as in effect on the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, shall have the option at any time after that date—

“(1) to retain its negotiated compact (in whole or in part) to the extent that the provisions of the compact are not directly contrary to any express provision of this title; or

“(2) to negotiate a new compact in a manner consistent with this title.

“SEC. 405. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

“(a) APPLICABILITY.—An Indian Tribe and the Secretary shall include in any compact or funding agreement provisions that reflect the requirements of this title.

“(b) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—An Indian Tribe participating in self-governance shall ensure that internal measures are in place to address, pursuant to Tribal law and procedures, conflicts of interest in the administration of programs.

“(c) AUDITS.—

“(1) SINGLE AGENCY AUDIT ACT.—Chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code, shall apply to a funding agreement under this title.

“(2) COST PRINCIPLES.—An Indian Tribe shall apply cost principles under the applicable Office of Management and Budget circular, except as modified by—

“(A) any provision of law, including section 106; or

“(B) any exemptions to applicable Office of Management and Budget circulars subsequently granted by the Office of Management and Budget.

“(3) FEDERAL CLAIMS.—Any claim by the Federal Government against an Indian Tribe relating to funds received under a funding agreement based on any audit under this subsection shall be subject to section 106(f).

“(d) REDESIGN AND CONSOLIDATION.—Except as provided in section 407, an Indian Tribe may redesign or consolidate programs, or reallocate funds for programs, in a compact or funding agreement in any manner that the Indian Tribe determines to be in the best interest of the Indian community being served—

“(1) so long as the redesign or consolidation does not have the effect of denying eligibility for services to population groups otherwise eligible to be served under applicable Federal law; and

“(2) except that, with respect to the reallocation, consolidation, and redesign of programs described in subsection (b)(2) or (c) of section 403, a joint agreement between the Secretary and the Indian Tribe shall be required.

“(e) RETROCESSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe may fully or partially retrocede to the Secretary any program under a compact or funding agreement.

“(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

“(A) AGREEMENT.—Unless an Indian Tribe rescinds a request for retrocession under paragraph (1), the retrocession shall become effective on the date specified by the parties in the compact or funding agreement.

“(B) NO AGREEMENT.—In the absence of a specification of an effective date in the compact or funding agreement, the retrocession shall become effective on—

“(i) the earlier of—

“(I) 1 year after the date on which the request is submitted; and

“(II) the date on which the funding agreement expires; or

“(ii) such date as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary and the Indian Tribe.

“(f) NONDUPLICATION.—A funding agreement shall provide that, for the period for which, and to the extent to which, funding is provided to an Indian Tribe under this title, the Indian Tribe—

“(1) shall not be entitled to contract with the Secretary for funds under section 102, except that the Indian Tribe shall be eligible for new programs on the same basis as other Indian Tribes; and

“(2) shall be responsible for the administration of programs in accordance with the compact or funding agreement.

“(g) RECORDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless an Indian Tribe specifies otherwise in the compact or funding agreement, records of an Indian Tribe shall not be considered to be Federal records for purposes of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code.

“(2) RECORDKEEPING SYSTEM.—An Indian Tribe shall—

“(A) maintain a recordkeeping system; and

“(B) on a notice period of not less than 30 days, provide the Secretary with reasonable access to the records to enable the Department to meet the requirements of sections 3101 through 3106 of title 44, United States Code.

**“SEC. 406. PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE SECRETARY.**

“(a) TRUST EVALUATIONS.—A funding agreement shall include a provision to monitor the performance of trust functions by the Indian Tribe through the annual trust evaluation.

“(b) REASSUMPTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A compact or funding agreement shall include provisions for the Secretary to reassume a program and associated funding if there is a specific finding relating to that program of—

“(A) imminent jeopardy to a trust asset, a natural resource, or public health and safety that—

“(i) is caused by an act or omission of the Indian Tribe; and

“(ii) arises out of a failure to carry out the compact or funding agreement; or

“(B) gross mismanagement with respect to funds transferred to an Indian Tribe under a compact or funding agreement, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Inspector General, as appropriate.

“(2) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary shall not reassume operation of a program, in whole or part, unless—

“(A) the Secretary first provides written notice and a hearing on the record to the Indian Tribe; and

“(B) the Indian Tribe does not take corrective action to remedy the mismanagement of the funds or programs, or the imminent jeopardy to a trust asset, natural resource, or public health and safety.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Secretary may, on written notice to the Indian Tribe, immediately reassume operation of a program if—

“(i) the Secretary makes a finding of imminent and substantial jeopardy and irreparable harm to a trust asset, a natural resource, or the public health and safety caused by an act or omission of the Indian Tribe; and

“(ii) the imminent and substantial jeopardy and irreparable harm to the trust asset, natural resource, or public health and safety arises out of a failure by the Indian Tribe to carry out the terms of an applicable compact or funding agreement.

“(B) REASSUMPTION.—If the Secretary reassumes operation of a program under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide the Indian Tribe with a hearing on the record not later than 10 days after the date of reassumption.

“(C) INABILITY TO AGREE ON COMPACT OR FUNDING AGREEMENT.—

“(1) FINAL OFFER.—If the Secretary and a participating Indian Tribe are unable to agree, in whole or in part, on the terms of a

compact or funding agreement (including funding levels), the Indian Tribe may submit a final offer to the Secretary.

“(2) DETERMINATION.—Not more than 60 days after the date of receipt of a final offer by one or more of the officials designated pursuant to paragraph (4), the Secretary shall review and make a determination with respect to the final offer, except that the 60-day period may be extended for up to 30 days for circumstances beyond the control of the Secretary, upon written request by the Secretary to the Indian Tribe.

“(3) EXTENSIONS.—The deadline described in paragraph (2) may be extended for any length of time, as agreed upon by both the Indian Tribe and the Secretary.

“(4) DESIGNATED OFFICIALS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate one or more appropriate officials in the Department to receive a copy of the final offer described in paragraph (1).

“(B) NO DESIGNATION.—If no official is designated, the Director of the Office of the Executive Secretariat and Regulatory Affairs shall be the designated official.

“(5) NO TIMELY DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary fails to make a determination with respect to a final offer within the period specified in paragraph (2), including any extension agreed to under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall be deemed to have agreed to the offer, except that with respect to any compact or funding agreement provision concerning a program described under section 403(c), the Secretary shall be deemed to have rejected the offer with respect to such provision and the terms of clauses (i) through (iv) of paragraphs (6)(A) shall apply.

“(6) REJECTION OF FINAL OFFER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary rejects a final offer (or one or more provisions or funding levels in a final offer), the Secretary shall—

“(i) provide timely written notification to the Indian Tribe that contains a specific finding that clearly demonstrates, or that is supported by a controlling legal authority, that—

“(I) the amount of funds proposed in the final offer exceeds the applicable funding level as determined under section 106(a)(1);

“(II) the program that is the subject of the final offer is an inherent Federal function or is subject to the discretion of the Secretary under section 403(c);

“(III) the Indian Tribe cannot carry out the program in a manner that would not result in significant danger or risk to the public health or safety, to natural resources, or to trust resources;

“(IV) the Indian Tribe is not eligible to participate in self-governance under section 402(c);

“(V) the funding agreement would violate a Federal statute or regulation; or

“(VI) with respect to a program or portion of a program included in a final offer pursuant to section 403(b)(2), the program or the portion of the program is not otherwise available to Indian Tribes or Indians under section 102(a)(1)(E);

“(ii) provide technical assistance to overcome the objections stated in the notification required by clause (i);

“(iii) provide the Indian Tribe with a hearing on the record with the right to engage in full discovery relevant to any issue raised in the matter, and the opportunity for appeal on the objections raised, except that the Indian Tribe may, in lieu of filing such appeal, directly proceed to initiate an action in a United States district court under section 110(a); and

“(iv) provide the Indian Tribe the option of entering into the severable portions of a final proposed compact or funding agreement (including a lesser funding amount, if any),

that the Secretary did not reject, subject to any additional alterations necessary to conform the compact or funding agreement to the severed provisions.

“(B) EFFECT OF EXERCISING CERTAIN OPTION.—If an Indian Tribe exercises the option specified in subparagraph (A)(iv)—

“(i) the Indian Tribe shall retain the right to appeal the rejection by the Secretary under this section; and

“(ii) clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall apply only to the portion of the proposed final compact or funding agreement that was rejected by the Secretary.

“(d) BURDEN OF PROOF.—In any administrative action, hearing, appeal, or civil action brought under this section, the Secretary shall have the burden of proof—

“(1) of demonstrating, by a preponderance of the evidence, the validity of the grounds for a reassumption under subsection (b); and

“(2) of clearly demonstrating the validity of the grounds for rejecting a final offer made under subsection (c).

“(e) GOOD FAITH.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the negotiation of compacts and funding agreements, the Secretary shall at all times negotiate in good faith to maximize implementation of the self-governance policy.

“(2) POLICY.—The Secretary shall carry out this title in a manner that maximizes the policy of Tribal self-governance.

“(f) SAVINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that programs carried out for the benefit of Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations under this title reduce the administrative or other responsibilities of the Secretary with respect to the operation of Indian programs and result in savings that have not otherwise been included in the amount of Tribal shares and other funds determined under section 408(c), except for funding agreements entered into for programs under section 403(c), the Secretary shall make such savings available to the Indian Tribes or Tribal organizations for the provision of additional services to program beneficiaries in a manner equitable to directly served, contracted, and compacted programs.

“(2) DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS OF SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE.—For any savings generated as a result of the assumption of a program by an Indian Tribe under section 403(c), such savings shall be made available to that Indian Tribe.

“(g) TRUST RESPONSIBILITY.—The Secretary may not waive, modify, or diminish in any way the trust responsibility of the United States with respect to Indian Tribes and individual Indians that exists under treaties, Executive orders, other laws, or court decisions.

“(h) DECISION MAKER.—A decision that constitutes final agency action and relates to an appeal within the Department conducted under subsection (c)(6)(A)(iii) may be made by—

“(1) an official of the Department who holds a position at a higher organizational level within the Department than the level of the departmental agency in which the decision that is the subject of the appeal was made; or

“(2) an administrative law judge.

“(i) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subject to section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, each provision of this title and each provision of a compact or funding agreement shall be liberally construed for the benefit of the Indian Tribe participating in self-governance, and any ambiguity shall be resolved in favor of the Indian Tribe.

**“SEC. 407. CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Indian Tribes participating in Tribal self-governance may carry

out any construction project included in a compact or funding agreement under this title.

“(b) TRIBAL OPTION TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out a construction project under this title, an Indian Tribe may, subject to the agreement of the Secretary, elect to assume some Federal responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code, and related provisions of other law and regulations that would apply if the Secretary were to undertake a construction project, by adopting a resolution—

“(1) designating a certifying Tribal officer to represent the Indian Tribe and to assume the status of a responsible Federal official under those Acts, laws, or regulations; and

“(2) accepting the jurisdiction of the United States courts for the purpose of enforcing the responsibilities of the certifying Tribal officer assuming the status of a responsible Federal official under those Acts, laws, or regulations.

“(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary to include in any compact or funding agreement duties of the Secretary under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code, and other related provisions of law that are inherent Federal functions.

“(d) CODES AND STANDARDS.—In carrying out a construction project under this title, an Indian Tribe shall—

“(1) adhere to applicable Federal, State, local, and Tribal building codes, architectural and engineering standards, and applicable Federal guidelines regarding design, space, and operational standards, appropriate for the particular project; and

“(2) use only architects and engineers who—

“(A) are licensed to practice in the State in which the facility will be built; and

“(B) certify that—

“(i) they are qualified to perform the work required by the specific construction involved; and

“(ii) upon completion of design, the plans and specifications meet or exceed the applicable construction and safety codes.

“(e) TRIBAL ACCOUNTABILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out a construction project under this title, an Indian Tribe shall assume responsibility for the successful completion of the construction project and of a facility that is usable for the purpose for which the Indian Tribe received funding.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—For each construction project carried out by an Indian Tribe under this title, the Indian Tribe and the Secretary shall negotiate a provision to be included in the funding agreement that identifies—

“(A) the approximate start and completion dates for the project, which may extend over a period of one or more years;

“(B) a general description of the project, including the scope of work, references to design criteria, and other terms and conditions;

“(C) the responsibilities of the Indian Tribe and the Secretary for the project;

“(D) how project-related environmental considerations will be addressed;

“(E) the amount of funds provided for the project;

“(F) the obligations of the Indian Tribe to comply with the codes referenced in subsection (d)(1) and applicable Federal laws and regulations;

“(G) the agreement of the parties over who will bear any additional costs necessary to

meet changes in scope, or errors or omissions in design and construction; and

“(H) the agreement of the Secretary to issue a certificate of occupancy, if requested by the Indian Tribe, based upon the review and verification by the Secretary, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that the Indian Tribe has secured upon completion the review and approval of the plans and specifications, sufficiency of design, life safety, and code compliance by qualified, licensed, and independent architects and engineers.

“(f) FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Funding appropriated for construction projects carried out under this title shall be included in funding agreements as annual or semiannual advance payments at the option of the Indian Tribe.

“(2) ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall include all associated project contingency funds with each advance payment, and the Indian Tribe shall be responsible for the management of such contingency funds.

“(g) NEGOTIATIONS.—At the option of the Indian Tribe, construction project funding proposals shall be negotiated pursuant to the statutory process in section 105, and any resulting construction project agreement shall be incorporated into the funding agreement as addenda.

“(h) FEDERAL REVIEW AND VERIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On a schedule negotiated by the Secretary and the Indian Tribe—

“(A) the Secretary shall review and verify, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that project planning and design documents prepared by the Indian Tribe in advance of initial construction are in conformity with the obligations of the Indian Tribe under subsection (d); and

“(B) before the project planning and design documents are implemented, the Secretary shall review and verify to the satisfaction of the Secretary that subsequent document amendments which result in a significant change in construction are in conformity with the obligations of the Indian Tribe under subsection (d).

“(2) REPORTS.—The Indian Tribe shall provide the Secretary with project progress and financial reports not less than semiannually.

“(3) OVERSIGHT VISITS.—The Secretary may conduct onsite project oversight visits semiannually or on an alternate schedule agreed to by the Secretary and the Indian Tribe.

“(i) APPLICATION OF OTHER LAWS.—Unless otherwise agreed to by the Indian Tribe and except as otherwise provided in this Act, no provision of title 41, United States Code, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, or any other law or regulation pertaining to Federal procurement (including Executive orders) shall apply to any construction program or project carried out under this title.

“(j) FUTURE FUNDING.—Upon completion of a facility constructed under this title, the Secretary shall include the facility among those eligible for annual operation and maintenance funding support comparable to that provided for similar facilities funded by the Department as annual appropriations are available and to the extent that the facility size and complexity and other factors do not exceed the funding formula criteria for comparable buildings.

“SEC. 408. PAYMENT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the governing body of an Indian Tribe and under the terms of an applicable funding agreement, the Secretary shall provide funding to the Indian Tribe to carry out the funding agreement.

“(b) ADVANCE ANNUAL PAYMENT.—At the option of the Indian Tribe, a funding agreement shall provide for an advance annual payment to an Indian Tribe.

“(c) AMOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (e) and sections 403 and 405, the Secretary shall provide funds to the Indian Tribe under a funding agreement for programs in an amount that is equal to the amount that the Indian Tribe would have been entitled to receive under contracts and grants under this Act (including amounts for direct program and contract support costs and, in addition, any funds that are specifically or functionally related to the provision by the Secretary of services and benefits to the Indian Tribe or its members) without regard to the organization level within the Department at which the programs are carried out.

“(2) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section reduces programs, services, or funds of, or provided to, another Indian Tribe.

“(d) TIMING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to the terms of any compact or funding agreement entered into under this title, the Secretary shall transfer to the Indian Tribe all funds provided for in the funding agreement, pursuant to subsection (c), and provide funding for periods covered by joint resolution adopted by Congress making continuing appropriations, to the extent permitted by such resolution.

“(2) TRANSFERS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, in any instance in which a funding agreement requires an annual transfer of funding to be made at the beginning of a fiscal year or requires semiannual or other periodic transfers of funding to be made commencing at the beginning of a fiscal year, the first such transfer shall be made not later than 10 days after the apportionment of such funds by the Office of Management and Budget to the Department, unless the funding agreement provides otherwise.

“(e) AVAILABILITY.—Funds for trust services to individual Indians shall be available under a funding agreement only to the extent that the same services that would have been provided by the Secretary are provided to individual Indians by the Indian Tribe.

“(f) MULTIYEAR FUNDING.—A funding agreement may provide for multiyear funding.

“(g) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall not—

“(1) fail to transfer to an Indian Tribe its full share of any central, headquarters, regional, area, or service unit office or other funds due under this title for programs eligible under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 403(b), except as required by Federal law;

“(2) withhold any portion of such funds for transfer over a period of years; or

“(3) reduce the amount of funds required under this title—

“(A) to make funding available for self-governance monitoring or administration by the Secretary;

“(B) in subsequent years, except as necessary as a result of—

“(i) a reduction in appropriations from the previous fiscal year for the program to be included in a compact or funding agreement;

“(ii) a congressional directive in legislation or an accompanying report;

“(iii) a Tribal authorization;

“(iv) a change in the amount of pass-through funds subject to the terms of the funding agreement; or

“(v) completion of an activity under a program for which the funds were provided;

“(C) to pay for Federal functions, including—

“(i) Federal pay costs;

“(ii) Federal employee retirement benefits;

“(iii) automated data processing;

“(iv) technical assistance; and

“(v) monitoring of activities under this title; or

“(D) to pay for costs of Federal personnel displaced by self-determination contracts



under this Act or self-governance under this title.

“(h) FEDERAL RESOURCES.—If an Indian Tribe elects to carry out a compact or funding agreement with the use of Federal personnel, Federal supplies (including supplies available from Federal warehouse facilities), Federal supply sources (including lodging, airline transportation, and other means of transportation, including the use of inter-agency motor pool vehicles), or other Federal resources (including supplies, services, and resources available to the Secretary under any procurement contracts in which the Department is eligible to participate), the Secretary shall, as soon as practicable, acquire and transfer such personnel, supplies, or resources to the Indian Tribe under this title.

“(i) PROMPT PAYMENT ACT.—Chapter 39 of title 31, United States Code, shall apply to the transfer of funds due under a compact or funding agreement authorized under this title.

“(j) INTEREST OR OTHER INCOME.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe may retain interest or income earned on any funds paid under a compact or funding agreement to carry out governmental purposes.

“(2) NO EFFECT ON OTHER AMOUNTS.—The retention of interest or income under paragraph (1) shall not diminish the amount of funds an Indian Tribe is entitled to receive under a funding agreement in the year the interest or income is earned or in any subsequent fiscal year.

“(3) INVESTMENT STANDARD.—Funds transferred under this title shall be managed by the Indian Tribe using the prudent investment standard, provided that the Secretary shall not be liable for any investment losses of funds managed by the Indian Tribe that are not otherwise guaranteed or insured by the Federal Government.

“(k) CARRYOVER OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of an appropriations Act, all funds paid to an Indian Tribe in accordance with a compact or funding agreement shall remain available until expended.

“(2) EFFECT OF CARRYOVER.—If an Indian Tribe elects to carry over funding from one year to the next, the carryover shall not diminish the amount of funds the Indian Tribe is entitled to receive under a funding agreement in that fiscal year or any subsequent fiscal year.

“(l) LIMITATION OF COSTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe shall not be obligated to continue performance that requires an expenditure of funds in excess of the amount of funds transferred under a compact or funding agreement.

“(2) NOTICE OF INSUFFICIENCY.—If at any time the Indian Tribe has reason to believe that the total amount provided for a specific activity under a compact or funding agreement is insufficient, the Indian Tribe shall provide reasonable notice of such insufficiency to the Secretary.

“(3) SUSPENSION OF PERFORMANCE.—If, after notice under paragraph (2), the Secretary does not increase the amount of funds transferred under the funding agreement, the Indian Tribe may suspend performance of the activity until such time as additional funds are transferred.

“(4) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section reduces any programs, services, or funds of, or provided to, another Indian Tribe.

“(m) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—The Office of Self-Governance shall be responsible for distribution of all Bureau of Indian Affairs funds provided under this title unless otherwise agreed by the parties to an applicable funding agreement.

“(n) APPLICABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, section 101(a)

of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act applies to subsections (a) through (m).

“SEC. 409. FACILITATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by law (including section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act), the Secretary shall interpret each Federal law and regulation in a manner that facilitates—

“(1) the inclusion of programs in funding agreements; and

“(2) the implementation of funding agreements.

“(b) REGULATION WAIVER.—

“(1) REQUEST.—An Indian Tribe may submit to the Secretary a written request for a waiver of applicability of a Federal regulation, including—

“(A) an identification of the specific text in the regulation sought to be waived; and

“(B) the basis for the request.

“(2) DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—Not later than 120 days after receipt by the Secretary and the designated officials under paragraph (4) of a request under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall approve or deny the requested waiver in writing to the Indian Tribe.

“(3) EXTENSIONS.—The deadline described in paragraph (2) may be extended for any length of time, as agreed upon by both the Indian Tribe and the Secretary.

“(4) DESIGNATED OFFICIALS.—The Secretary shall designate one or more appropriate officials in the Department to receive a copy of the waiver request described in paragraph (1).

“(5) GROUNDS FOR DENIAL.—The Secretary may deny a request under paragraph (1) upon a specific finding by the Secretary that the identified text in the regulation may not be waived because such a waiver is prohibited by Federal law.

“(6) FAILURE TO MAKE DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary fails to make a determination with respect to a waiver request within the period specified in paragraph (2) (including any extension agreed to under paragraph (3)), the Secretary shall be deemed to have agreed to the request, except that for a waiver request relating to programs eligible under section 403(b)(2) or section 403(c), the Secretary shall be deemed to have denied the request.

“(7) FINALITY.—A decision of the Secretary under this section shall be final for the Department.

“SEC. 410. DISCRETIONARY APPLICATION OF OTHER SECTIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in section 201(d) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, at the option of a participating Indian Tribe or Indian Tribes, any of the provisions of title I may be incorporated in any compact or funding agreement under this title. The inclusion of any such provision shall be subject to, and shall not conflict with, section 101(a) of such Act.

“(b) EFFECT.—Each incorporated provision under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) have the same force and effect as if set out in full in this title;

“(2) supplement or replace any related provision in this title; and

“(3) apply to any agency otherwise governed by this title.

“(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—If an Indian Tribe requests incorporation at the negotiation stage of a compact or funding agreement, the incorporation shall—

“(1) be effective immediately; and

“(2) control the negotiation and resulting compact and funding agreement.

“SEC. 411. ANNUAL BUDGET LIST.

“The Secretary shall list, in the annual budget request submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, any funds proposed to be included in funding agreements authorized under this title.

“SEC. 412. REPORTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—On January 1 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report regarding the administration of this title.

“(2) ANALYSIS.—Any Indian Tribe may submit to the Office of Self-Governance and to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed annual analysis of unmet Tribal needs for funding agreements under this title.

“(b) CONTENTS.—The report under subsection (a)(1) shall—

“(1) be compiled from information contained in funding agreements, annual audit reports, and data of the Secretary regarding the disposition of Federal funds;

“(2) identify—

“(A) the relative costs and benefits of self-governance;

“(B) with particularity, all funds that are specifically or functionally related to the provision by the Secretary of services and benefits to self-governance Indian Tribes and members of Indian Tribes;

“(C) the funds transferred to each Indian Tribe and the corresponding reduction in the Federal employees and workload; and

“(D) the funding formula for individual Tribal shares of all Central Office funds, together with the comments of affected Indian Tribes, developed under subsection (d);

“(3) before being submitted to Congress, be distributed to the Indian Tribes for comment (with a comment period of not less than 30 days);

“(4) include the separate views and comments of each Indian Tribe or Tribal organization; and

“(5) include a list of—

“(A) all such programs that the Secretary determines, in consultation with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, are eligible for negotiation to be included in a funding agreement at the request of a participating Indian Tribe; and

“(B) all such programs which Indian Tribes have formally requested to include in a funding agreement under section 403(c) due to the special geographic, historical, or cultural significance of the program to the Indian Tribe, indicating whether each request was granted or denied, and stating the grounds for any denial.

“(c) REPORT ON NON-BIA PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to optimize opportunities for including non-BIA programs in agreements with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance under this title, the Secretary shall review all programs administered by the Department, other than through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, or the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians, without regard to the agency or office concerned.

“(2) PROGRAMMATIC TARGETS.—The Secretary shall establish programmatic targets, after consultation with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, to encourage bureaus of the Department to ensure that an appropriate portion of those programs are available to be included in funding agreements.

“(3) PUBLICATION.—The lists under subsection (b)(5) and targets under paragraph (2) shall be published in the Federal Register and made available to any Indian Tribe participating in self-governance.

“(4) ANNUAL REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall annually review and publish in the Federal Register, after consultation with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, revised lists and programmatic targets.

“(B) CONTENTS.—In preparing the revised lists and programmatic targets, the Secretary shall consider all programs that were

eligible for contracting in the original list published in the Federal Register in 1995, except for programs specifically determined not to be contractible as a matter of law.

“(d) REPORT ON CENTRAL OFFICE FUNDS.—Not later than January 1, 2020, the Secretary shall, in consultation with Indian Tribes, develop a funding formula to determine the individual Tribal share of funds controlled by the Central Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of the Special Trustee for inclusion in the compacts.

**“SEC. 413. REGULATIONS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) PROMULGATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, the Secretary shall initiate procedures under subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, to negotiate and promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this title.

“(2) PUBLICATION OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS.—Proposed regulations to implement this title shall be published in the Federal Register not later than 21 months after the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act.

“(3) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to promulgate regulations under paragraph (1) shall expire on the date that is 30 months after the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act.

“(b) COMMITTEE.—

“(1) MEMBERSHIP.—A negotiated rule-making committee established pursuant to section 565 of title 5, United States Code, to carry out this section shall have as its members only representatives of the Federal Government and Tribal government.

“(2) LEAD AGENCY.—Among the Federal representatives described in paragraph (1), the Office of Self-Governance shall be the lead agency for the Department.

“(c) ADAPTATION OF PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall adapt the negotiated rule-making procedures to the unique context of self-governance and the government-to-government relationship between the United States and Indian Tribes.

“(d) EFFECT.—

“(1) REPEAL.—The Secretary may repeal any regulation that is inconsistent with this Act.

“(2) CONFLICTING PROVISIONS.—Subject to section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act and except with respect to programs described under section 403(c), this title shall supersede any conflicting provision of law (including any conflicting regulations).

“(3) EFFECTIVENESS WITHOUT REGARD TO REGULATIONS.—The lack of promulgated regulations on an issue shall not limit the effect or implementation of this title.

**“SEC. 414. EFFECT OF CIRCULARS, POLICIES, MANUALS, GUIDANCE, AND RULES.**

“Unless expressly agreed to by a participating Indian Tribe in a compact or funding agreement, the participating Indian Tribe shall not be subject to any agency circular, policy, manual, guidance, or rule adopted by the Department, except for—

“(1) the eligibility provisions of section 105(g); and

“(2) regulations promulgated pursuant to section 413.

**“SEC. 415. APPEALS.**

“Except as provided in section 406(d), in any administrative action, appeal, or civil action for judicial review of any decision made by the Secretary under this title, the Secretary shall have the burden of proof of demonstrating by a preponderance of the evidence—

“(1) the validity of the grounds for the decision; and

“(2) the consistency of the decision with the requirements and policies of this title.

**“SEC. 416. APPLICATION OF OTHER PROVISIONS.**

“Section 314 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-512; 104 Stat. 1959), shall apply to compacts and funding agreements entered into under this title.

**“SEC. 417. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

“There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title.”

**TITLE II—INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION**

**SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS; REPORTING AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS; APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304) is amended by striking subsection (j) and inserting the following:

“(j) ‘self-determination contract’ means a contract entered into under title I (or a grant or cooperative agreement used under section 9) between a Tribal organization and the appropriate Secretary for the planning, conduct, and administration of programs or services that are otherwise provided to Indian Tribes and members of Indian Tribes pursuant to Federal law, subject to the condition that, except as provided in section 105(a)(3), no contract entered into under title I (or grant or cooperative agreement used under section 9) shall be—

“(1) considered to be a procurement contract; or

“(2) except as provided in section 107(a)(1), subject to any Federal procurement law (including regulations);”

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304), as amended by paragraph (1), is further amended—

(A) in subsection (e), by striking “‘Indian tribe’ means” and inserting “‘Indian tribe’ or ‘Indian Tribe’ means”; and

(B) in subsection (1), by striking “‘tribal organization’ means” and inserting “‘Tribal organization’ or ‘tribal organization’ means”.

(b) REPORTING AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 5 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5305) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “after completion of the project or undertaking referred to in the preceding subsection of this section” and inserting “after the retention period for the report that is submitted to the Secretary under subsection (a)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “The retention period shall be defined in regulations promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to section 413.”; and

(2) in subsection (f)(1), by inserting “if the Indian Tribal organization expends \$500,000 or more in Federal awards during such fiscal year” after “under this Act.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (b)(2) shall not take effect until 14 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) APPLICATION OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 102(c), 104, 105(a)(1), 105(f), 110, and 111 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304, 5305, 5306, 5307, 5321(c), 5323, 5324(a)(1), 5324(f), 5331, and 5332) and section 314 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-512; 104 Stat. 1959), apply to compacts and funding agreements entered into under title IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5361 et seq.).

**SEC. 202. CONTRACTS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.**

Section 102 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5321) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “economic enterprises” and all that follows through “except that” and inserting “economic enterprises (as defined in section 3 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1452)), except that”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) GOOD FAITH REQUIREMENT.—In the negotiation of contracts and funding agreements, the Secretary shall—

“(1) at all times negotiate in good faith to maximize implementation of the self-determination policy; and

“(2) carry out this Act in a manner that maximizes the policy of Tribal self-determination, in a manner consistent with—

“(A) the purposes specified in section 3; and

“(B) the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act.

“(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subject to section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, each provision of this Act and each provision of a contract or funding agreement shall be liberally construed for the benefit of the Indian Tribe participating in self-determination, and any ambiguity shall be resolved in favor of the Indian Tribe.”

**SEC. 203. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.**

Section 105 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5324) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the first sentence, by striking “pursuant to” and all that follows through “of this Act” and inserting “pursuant to sections 102 and 103”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(p) INTERPRETATION BY SECRETARY.—Except as otherwise provided by law, the Secretary shall interpret all Federal laws (including regulations) and Executive orders in a manner that facilitates, to the maximum extent practicable—

“(1) the inclusion in self-determination contracts and funding agreements of—

“(A) applicable programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof); and

“(B) funds associated with those programs, services, functions, and activities;

“(2) the implementation of self-determination contracts and funding agreements; and

“(3) the achievement of Tribal health objectives.

“(q)(1) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR INTERNAL CONTROLS.—In considering proposals for, amendments to, or in the course of, a contract under this title and compacts under titles IV and V of this Act, if the Secretary determines that the Indian Tribe lacks adequate internal controls necessary to manage the contracted program or programs, the Secretary shall, as soon as practicable, provide the necessary technical assistance to assist the Indian Tribe in developing adequate internal controls. As part of that technical assistance, the Secretary and the Tribe shall develop a plan for assessing the subsequent effectiveness of such technical assistance. The inability of the Secretary to provide technical assistance or lack of a plan under this subsection shall not result in the re-assumption of an existing agreement, contract, or compact, or declination or rejection of a new agreement, contract, or compact.

“(2) The Secretary shall prepare a report to be included in the information required for the reports under sections 412(b)(2)(A) and 514(b)(2)(A). The Secretary shall include in this report, in the aggregate, a description of the internal controls that were inadequate, the technical assistance provided, and a description of Secretarial actions

taken to address any remaining inadequate internal controls after the provision of technical assistance and implementation of the plan required by paragraph (1).”

**SEC. 204. CONTRACT FUNDING AND INDIRECT COSTS.**

Section 106(a)(3) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5325(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—  
(A) in clause (i), by striking “, and” and inserting “; and”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “expense related to the overhead incurred” and inserting “expense incurred by the governing body of the Indian Tribe or Tribal organization and any overhead expense incurred”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) In calculating the reimbursement rate for expenses described in subparagraph (A)(ii), not less than 50 percent of the expenses described in subparagraph (A)(ii) that are incurred by the governing body of an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization relating to a Federal program, function, service, or activity carried out pursuant to the contract shall be considered to be reasonable and allowable.”

**SEC. 205. CONTRACT OR GRANT SPECIFICATIONS.**

Section 108 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5329) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting “subject to subsections (a) and (b) of section 102,” before “contain”;

(2) in subsection (f)(2)(A)(ii) of the model agreement contained in subsection (c), by inserting “subject to subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5321),” before “such other provisions”;

(3) in subsection (b)(7)(C) of the model agreement contained in subsection (c), in the second sentence of the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “one performance monitoring visit” and inserting “two performance monitoring visits”.

S. 256

*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 “Esther Martinez Native American Languages Programs Reauthorization Act”.

**SEC. 2. NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES GRANT PROGRAM.**

Section 803C of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991b-3) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “10” and inserting “5”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “15” and inserting “10”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(2)—

(A) by striking “or 3-year basis” and inserting “3-year, 4-year, or 5-year basis”; and  
(B) by inserting “, 4-year, or 5-year” after “on a 3-year”.

**SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 816(e) of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d(e)) is amended by striking “such sums” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “\$13,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 816 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d) is amended in subsections (a) and (b) by striking “subsection (e)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (d)”.

S. 294

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Native American Business Incubators Program Act”.

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds that—

(1) entrepreneurs face specific challenges when transforming ideas into profitable business enterprises;

(2) entrepreneurs that want to provide products and services in reservation communities face an additional set of challenges that requires special knowledge;

(3) a business incubator is an organization that assists entrepreneurs in navigating obstacles that prevent innovative ideas from becoming viable businesses by providing services that include—

(A) workspace and facilities resources;  
(B) access to capital, business education, and counseling;

(C) networking opportunities;

(D) mentorship opportunities; and

(E) an environment intended to help establish and expand business operations;

(4) the business incubator model is suited to accelerating entrepreneurship in reservation communities because the business incubator model promotes collaboration to address shared challenges and provides individually tailored services for the purpose of overcoming obstacles unique to each participating business; and

(5) business incubators will stimulate economic development by providing Native entrepreneurs with the tools necessary to grow businesses that offer products and services to reservation communities.

**SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) BUSINESS INCUBATOR.—The term “business incubator” means an organization that—

(A) provides physical workspace and facilities resources to startups and established businesses; and

(B) is designed to accelerate the growth and success of businesses through a variety of business support resources and services, including—

(i) access to capital, business education, and counseling;

(ii) networking opportunities;

(iii) mentorship opportunities; and

(iv) other services intended to aid in developing a business.

(2) ELIGIBLE APPLICANT.—The term “eligible applicant” means an applicant eligible to apply for a grant under section 4(b).

(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(4) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(5) NATIVE AMERICAN; NATIVE.—The terms “Native American” and “Native” have the meaning given the term “Indian” in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(6) NATIVE BUSINESS.—The term “Native business” means a business concern that is at least 51-percent owned and controlled by 1 or more Native Americans.

(7) NATIVE ENTREPRENEUR.—The term “Native entrepreneur” means an entrepreneur who is a Native American.

(8) PROGRAM.—The term “program” means the program established under section 4(a).

(9) RESERVATION.—The term “reservation” has the meaning given the term in section 3

of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1452).

(10) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(11) TRIBAL COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.—The term “tribal college or university” has the meaning given the term “Tribal College or University” in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)).

**SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program in the Office of Indian Energy and Economic Development under which the Secretary shall provide financial assistance in the form of competitive grants to eligible applicants for the establishment and operation of business incubators that serve reservation communities by providing business incubation and other business services to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs.

(b) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under the program, an applicant shall—

(A) be—

(i) an Indian tribe;

(ii) a tribal college or university;

(iii) an institution of higher education; or  
(iv) a private nonprofit organization or tribal nonprofit organization that—

(I) provides business and financial technical assistance; and

(II) will commit to serving 1 or more reservation communities;

(B) be able to provide the physical workspace, equipment, and connectivity necessary for Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs to collaborate and conduct business on a local, regional, national, and international level; and

(C) in the case of an entity described in clauses (ii) through (iv) of subparagraph (A), have been operational for not less than 1 year before receiving a grant under the program.

(2) JOINT PROJECT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Two or more entities may submit a joint application for a project that combines the resources and expertise of those entities at a physical location dedicated to assisting Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs under the program.

(B) CONTENTS.—A joint application submitted under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) contain a certification that each participant of the joint project is one of the eligible entities described in paragraph (1)(A); and

(ii) demonstrate that together the participants meet the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1).

(c) APPLICATION AND SELECTION PROCESS.—

(1) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Each eligible applicant desiring a grant under the program shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including—

(A) a certification that the applicant—

(i) is an eligible applicant;

(ii) will designate an executive director or program manager, if such director or manager has not been designated, to manage the business incubator; and

(iii) agrees—

(I) to a site evaluation by the Secretary as part of the final selection process;

(II) to an annual programmatic and financial examination for the duration of the grant; and

(III) to the maximum extent practicable, to remedy any problems identified pursuant to the site evaluation under subclause (I) or an examination under subclause (II);

(B) a description of the 1 or more reservation communities to be served by the business incubator;

(C) a 3-year plan that describes—

(i) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs to be participating in the business incubator;

(ii) whether the business incubator will focus on a particular type of business or industry;

(iii) a detailed breakdown of the services to be offered to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in the business incubator; and

(iv) a detailed breakdown of the services, if any, to be offered to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs not participating in the business incubator;

(D) information demonstrating the effectiveness and experience of the eligible applicant in—

(i) conducting financial, management, and marketing assistance programs designed to educate or improve the business skills of current or prospective businesses;

(ii) working in and providing services to Native American communities;

(iii) providing assistance to entities conducting business in reservation communities;

(iv) providing technical assistance under Federal business and entrepreneurial development programs for which Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs are eligible; and

(v) managing finances and staff effectively; and

(E) a site description of the location at which the eligible applicant will provide physical workspace, including a description of the technologies, equipment, and other resources that will be available to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in the business incubator.

(2) EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating each application, the Secretary shall consider—

(i) the ability of the eligible applicant—

(I) to operate a business incubator that effectively imparts entrepreneurship and business skills to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs, as demonstrated by the experience and qualifications of the eligible applicant;

(II) to commence providing services within a minimum period of time, to be determined by the Secretary; and

(III) to provide quality incubation services to a significant number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;

(ii) the experience of the eligible applicant in providing services in Native American communities, including in the 1 or more reservation communities described in the application; and

(iii) the proposed location of the business incubator.

(B) PRIORITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating the proposed location of the business incubator under subparagraph (A)(iii), the Secretary shall—

(I) consider the program goal of achieving broad geographic distribution of business incubators; and

(II) except as provided in clause (ii), give priority to eligible applicants that will provide business incubation services on or near the reservation of the 1 or more communities that were described in the application.

(ii) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may give priority to an eligible applicant that is not located on or near the reservation of the 1 or more communities that were described in the application if the Secretary determines that—

(I) the location of the business incubator will not prevent the eligible applicant from providing quality business incubation services to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs from the 1 or more reservation communities to be served; and

(II) siting the business incubator in the identified location will serve the interests of the 1 or more reservation communities to be served.

(3) SITE EVALUATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before making a grant to an eligible applicant, the Secretary shall conduct a site visit, evaluate a video submission, or evaluate a written site proposal (if the applicant is not yet in possession of the site) of the proposed site to ensure the proposed site will permit the eligible applicant to meet the requirements of the program.

(B) WRITTEN SITE PROPOSAL.—A written site proposal shall meet the requirements described in paragraph (1)(E) and contain—

(i) sufficient detail for the Secretary to ensure in the absence of a site visit or video submission that the proposed site will permit the eligible applicant to meet the requirements of the program; and

(ii) a timeline describing when the eligible applicant will be—

(I) in possession of the proposed site; and

(II) operating the business incubator at the proposed site.

(C) FOLLOWUP.—Not later than 1 year after awarding a grant to an eligible applicant that submits an application with a written site proposal, the Secretary shall conduct a site visit or evaluate a video submission of the site to ensure the site is consistent with the written site proposal.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) DURATION.—Each grant awarded under the program shall be for a term of 3 years.

(2) PAYMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall disburse grant funds awarded to an eligible applicant in annual installments.

(B) MORE FREQUENT DISBURSEMENTS.—On request by the applicant, the Secretary may make disbursements of grant funds more frequently than annually, on the condition that disbursements shall be made not more frequently than quarterly.

(3) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INITIAL ASSISTANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an eligible applicant that receives a grant under the program shall provide non-Federal contributions in an amount equal to not less than 25 percent of the grant amount disbursed each year.

(B) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive, in whole or in part, the requirements of subparagraph (A) with respect to an eligible applicant if, after considering the ability of the eligible applicant to provide non-Federal contributions, the Secretary determines that—

(i) the proposed business incubator will provide quality business incubation services; and

(ii) the 1 or more reservation communities to be served are unlikely to receive similar services because of remoteness or other reasons that inhibit the provision of business and entrepreneurial development services.

(4) RENEWALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may renew a grant award under the program for a term not to exceed 3 years.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining whether to renew a grant award, the Secretary shall consider with respect to the eligible applicant—

(i) the results of the annual evaluations of the eligible applicant under subsection (f)(1);

(ii) the performance of the business incubator of the eligible applicant, as compared to the performance of other business incubators receiving assistance under the program;

(iii) whether the eligible applicant continues to be eligible for the program; and

(iv) the evaluation considerations for initial awards under subsection (c)(2).

(C) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RENEWALS.—An eligible applicant that receives a grant renewal under subparagraph (A) shall provide non-Federal contributions in an amount equal to not less than 33 percent of the total amount of the grant.

(5) NO DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—An eligible applicant shall not be awarded a grant under the program that is duplicative of existing Federal funding from another source.

(e) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible applicant receiving a grant under the program may use grant amounts—

(A) to provide physical workspace and facilities for Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in the business incubator;

(B) to establish partnerships with other institutions and entities to provide comprehensive business incubation services to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in the business incubator; and

(C) for any other uses typically associated with business incubators that the Secretary determines to be appropriate and consistent with the purposes of the program.

(2) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—Each eligible applicant receiving a grant under the program shall—

(A) offer culturally tailored incubation services to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;

(B) use a competitive process for selecting Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs to participate in the business incubator;

(C) provide physical workspace that permits Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs to conduct business and collaborate with other Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;

(D) provide entrepreneurship and business skills training and education to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs including—

(i) financial education, including training and counseling in—

(I) applying for and securing business credit and investment capital;

(II) preparing and presenting financial statements; and

(III) managing cash flow and other financial operations of a business;

(ii) management education, including training and counseling in planning, organization, staffing, directing, and controlling each major activity or function of a business or startup; and

(iii) marketing education, including training and counseling in—

(I) identifying and segmenting domestic and international market opportunities;

(II) preparing and executing marketing plans;

(III) locating contract opportunities;

(IV) negotiating contracts; and

(V) using varying public relations and advertising techniques;

(E) provide direct mentorship or assistance finding mentors in the industry in which the Native business or Native entrepreneur operates or intends to operate; and

(F) provide access to networks of potential investors, professionals in the same or similar fields, and other business owners with similar businesses.

(3) TECHNOLOGY.—Each eligible applicant shall leverage technology to the maximum extent practicable to provide Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs with access to the connectivity tools needed to compete and thrive in 21st-century markets.

(f) OVERSIGHT.—

(1) ANNUAL EVALUATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary awards a grant to an eligible applicant under the program, and annually thereafter for the duration of the grant, the Secretary shall

conduct an evaluation of, and prepare a report on, the eligible applicant, which shall—

(A) describe the performance of the eligible applicant; and

(B) be used in determining the ongoing eligibility of the eligible applicant.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary awards a grant to an eligible applicant under the program, and annually thereafter for the duration of the grant, each eligible applicant receiving an award under the program shall submit to the Secretary a report describing the services the eligible applicant provided under the program during the preceding year.

(B) REPORT CONTENT.—The report described in subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) a detailed breakdown of the Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs receiving services from the business incubator, including, for the year covered by the report—

(I) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in or receiving services from the business incubator and the types of services provided to those Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;

(II) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs established and jobs created or maintained; and

(III) the performance of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs while participating in the business incubator and after graduation or departure from the business incubator; and

(ii) any other information the Secretary may require to evaluate the performance of a business incubator to ensure appropriate implementation of the program.

(C) LIMITATIONS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall not require an eligible applicant to report under subparagraph (A) information provided to the Secretary by the eligible applicant under other programs.

(D) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the heads of other Federal agencies to ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, the report content and form under subparagraphs (A) and (B) are consistent with other reporting requirements for Federal programs that provide business and entrepreneurial assistance.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the Secretary first awards funding under the program, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the performance and effectiveness of the program.

(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) account for each program year; and

(ii) include with respect to each business incubator receiving grant funds under the program—

(I) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs that received business incubation or other services;

(II) the number of businesses established with the assistance of the business incubator;

(III) the number of jobs established or maintained by Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs receiving business incubation services, including a description of where the jobs are located with respect to reservation communities;

(IV) to the maximum extent practicable, the amount of capital investment and loan financing accessed by Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs receiving business incubation services; and

(V) an evaluation of the overall performance of the business incubator.

**SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to implement the program.

**SEC. 6. SCHOOLS TO BUSINESS INCUBATOR PIPELINE.**

The Secretary shall facilitate the establishment of relationships between eligible applicants receiving funds through the program and educational institutions serving Native American communities, including tribal colleges and universities.

**SEC. 7. AGENCY PARTNERSHIPS.**

The Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that business incubators receiving grant funds under the program have the information and materials needed to provide Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs with the information and assistance necessary to apply for business and entrepreneurial development programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Treasury, and the Small Business Administration.

**SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the program \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

S. 257

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Tribal HUD-VASH Act of 2019”.

**SEC. 2. RENTAL ASSISTANCE FOR HOMELESS OR AT-RISK INDIAN VETERANS.**

Section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) INDIAN VETERANS HOUSING RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph:

“(I) ELIGIBLE INDIAN VETERAN.—The term ‘eligible Indian veteran’ means an Indian veteran who is—

“(aa) homeless or at risk of homelessness; and

“(bb) living—

“(AA) on or near a reservation; or

“(BB) in or near any other Indian area.

“(II) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term ‘eligible recipient’ means a recipient eligible to receive a grant under section 101 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4111).

“(III) INDIAN; INDIAN AREA.—The terms ‘Indian’ and ‘Indian area’ have the meanings given those terms in section 4 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4103).

“(IV) INDIAN VETERAN.—The term ‘Indian veteran’ means an Indian who is a veteran.

“(V) PROGRAM.—The term ‘Program’ means the Tribal HUD-VASH program carried out under clause (ii).

“(VI) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘tribal organization’ has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

“(ii) PROGRAM SPECIFICATIONS.—The Secretary shall use not less than 5 percent of the amounts made available for rental assistance under this paragraph to carry out a rental assistance and supported housing program, to be known as the ‘Tribal HUD-VASH program’, in conjunction with the Secretary

of Veterans Affairs, by awarding grants for the benefit of eligible Indian veterans.

“(iii) MODEL.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subclause (II), the Secretary shall model the Program on the rental assistance and supported housing program authorized under subparagraph (A) and applicable appropriations Acts, including administration in conjunction with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

“(II) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(aa) SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.—After consultation with Indian tribes, eligible recipients, and any other appropriate tribal organizations, the Secretary may make necessary and appropriate modifications to facilitate the use of the Program by eligible recipients to serve eligible Indian veterans.

“(bb) SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—After consultation with Indian tribes, eligible recipients, and any other appropriate tribal organizations, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may make necessary and appropriate modifications to facilitate the use of the Program by eligible recipients to serve eligible Indian veterans.

“(iv) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary shall make amounts for rental assistance and associated administrative costs under the Program available in the form of grants to eligible recipients.

“(v) FUNDING CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall award grants under the Program based on—

“(I) need;

“(II) administrative capacity; and

“(III) any other funding criteria established by the Secretary in a notice published in the Federal Register after consulting with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

“(vi) ADMINISTRATION.—Grants awarded under the Program shall be administered in accordance with the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.), except that recipients shall—

“(I) submit to the Secretary, in a manner prescribed by the Secretary, reports on the utilization of rental assistance provided under the Program; and

“(II) provide to the Secretary information specified by the Secretary to assess the effectiveness of the Program in serving eligible Indian veterans.

“(vii) CONSULTATION.—

“(I) GRANT RECIPIENTS; TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall consult with eligible recipients and any other appropriate tribal organization on the design of the Program to ensure the effective delivery of rental assistance and supportive services to eligible Indian veterans under the Program.

“(II) INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.—The Director of the Indian Health Service shall provide any assistance requested by the Secretary or the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in carrying out the Program.

“(viii) WAIVER.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subclause (II), the Secretary may waive or specify alternative requirements for any provision of law (including regulations) that the Secretary administers in connection with the use of rental assistance made available under the Program if the Secretary finds that the waiver or alternative requirement is necessary for the effective delivery and administration of rental assistance under the Program to eligible Indian veterans.

“(II) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may not waive or specify alternative requirements under subclause (I) for any provision of law (including regulations) relating to labor standards or the environment.

“(ix) RENEWAL GRANTS.—The Secretary may—

“(I) set aside, from amounts made available for tenant-based rental assistance under this subsection and without regard to the amounts used for new grants under clause (ii), such amounts as may be necessary to award renewal grants to eligible recipients that received a grant under the Program in a previous year; and

“(II) specify criteria that an eligible recipient must satisfy to receive a renewal grant under subclause (I), including providing data on how the eligible recipient used the amounts of any grant previously received under the Program.

“(x) REPORTING.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Tribal HUD-VASH Act of 2019, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Director of the Indian Health Service, shall—

“(aa) conduct a review of the implementation of the Program, including any factors that may have limited its success; and

“(bb) submit a report describing the results of the review under item (aa) to—

“(AA) the Committee on Indian Affairs, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(BB) the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs of the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

“(II) ANALYSIS OF HOUSING STOCK LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall include in the initial report submitted under subclause (I) a description of—

“(aa) any regulations governing the use of formula current assisted stock (as defined in section 1000.314 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)) within the Program; and

“(bb) the number of recipients of grants under the Program that have reported the regulations described in item (aa) as a barrier to implementation of the Program; and

“(cc) proposed alternative legislation or regulations developed by the Secretary in consultation with recipients of grants under the Program to allow the use of formula current assisted stock within the Program.”.

S. 216

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation Equitable Compensation Act”.

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) from 1927 to 1931, at the direction of Congress, the Corps of Engineers investigated the Columbia River and its tributaries to determine sites at which power could be produced at low cost;

(2) under section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 803(e)), when licenses are issued involving tribal land within an Indian reservation, a reasonable annual charge shall be fixed for the use of the land, subject to the approval of the Indian tribe having jurisdiction over the land;

(3) in August 1933, the Columbia Basin Commission, an agency of the State of Washington, received a preliminary permit from the Federal Power Commission for water power development at the Grand Coulee site;

(4) had the Columbia Basin Commission or a private entity developed the site, the Spo-

kane Tribe would have been entitled to a reasonable annual charge for the use of the land of the Spokane Tribe;

(5) in the mid-1930s, the Federal Government, which is not subject to licensing under the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792 et seq.)—

(A) federalized the Grand Coulee Dam project; and

(B) began construction of the Grand Coulee Dam;

(6) when the Grand Coulee Dam project was federalized, the Federal Government recognized that—

(A) development of the project affected the interests of the Spokane Tribe and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation; and

(B) it would be appropriate for the Spokane and Colville Tribes to receive a share of revenue from the disposition of power produced at Grand Coulee Dam;

(7) in the Act of June 29, 1940 (16 U.S.C. 835d et seq.), Congress—

(A) granted to the United States—

(i) in aid of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Columbia Basin Project, all the right, title, and interest of the Spokane Tribe and Colville Tribes in and to the tribal and allotted land within the Spokane and Colville Reservations, as designated by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time; and

(ii) other interests in that land as required and as designated by the Secretary for certain construction activities undertaken in connection with the project; and

(B) provided that compensation for the land and other interests was to be determined by the Secretary in such amounts as the Secretary determined to be just and equitable;

(8) pursuant to that Act, the Secretary paid—

(A) to the Spokane Tribe, \$4,700; and

(B) to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, \$63,000;

(9) in 1994, following litigation under the Act of August 13, 1946 (commonly known as the “Indian Claims Commission Act” (60 Stat. 1049, chapter 959; former 25 U.S.C. 70 et seq.)), Congress ratified the Colville Settlement Agreement, which required—

(A) for past use of the land of the Colville Tribes, a payment of \$53,000,000; and

(B) for continued use of the land of the Colville Tribes, annual payments of \$15,250,000, adjusted annually based on revenues from the sale of electric power from the Grand Coulee Dam project and transmission of that power by the Bonneville Power Administration;

(10) the Spokane Tribe, having suffered harm similar to that suffered by the Colville Tribes, did not file a claim within the 5-year statute of limitations under the Indian Claims Commission Act;

(11) neither the Colville Tribes nor the Spokane Tribe filed claims for compensation for use of the land of the respective tribes with the Commission prior to August 13, 1951, but both tribes filed unrelated land claims prior to August 13, 1951;

(12) in 1976, over objections by the United States, the Colville Tribes were successful in amending the 1951 Claims Commission land claims to add the Grand Coulee claim of the Colville Tribes;

(13) the Spokane Tribe had no such claim to amend, having settled the Claims Commission land claims of the Spokane Tribe with the United States in 1967;

(14) the Spokane Tribe has suffered significant harm from the construction and operation of Grand Coulee Dam;

(15) Spokane tribal acreage taken by the United States for the construction of Grand Coulee Dam equaled approximately 39 per-

cent of Colville tribal acreage taken for construction of the dam;

(16) the payments and delegation made pursuant to this Act constitute fair and equitable compensation for the past and continued use of Spokane tribal land for the production of hydropower at Grand Coulee Dam; and

(17) by vote of the Spokane tribal membership, the Spokane Tribe has resolved that the payments and delegation made pursuant to this Act constitute fair and equitable compensation for the past and continued use of Spokane tribal land for the production of hydropower at Grand Coulee Dam.

#### SEC. 3. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to provide fair and equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe for the use of the land of the Spokane Tribe for the generation of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam.

#### SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration or the head of any successor agency, corporation, or entity that markets power produced at Grand Coulee Dam.

(2) COLVILLE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term “Colville Settlement Agreement” means the Settlement Agreement entered into between the United States and the Colville Tribes, signed by the United States on April 21, 1994, and by the Colville Tribes on April 16, 1994, to settle the claims of the Colville Tribes in Docket 181-D of the Indian Claims Commission, which docket was transferred to the United States Court of Federal Claims.

(3) COLVILLE TRIBES.—The term “Colville Tribes” means the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

(4) COMPUTED ANNUAL PAYMENT.—The term “Computed Annual Payment” means the payment calculated under paragraph 2.b. of the Colville Settlement Agreement, without regard to any increase or decrease in the payment under section 2.d. of the agreement.

(5) CONFEDERATED TRIBES ACT.—The term “Confederated Tribes Act” means the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation Grand Coulee Dam Settlement Act (Public Law 103-436; 108 Stat. 4577).

(6) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(7) SPOKANE BUSINESS COUNCIL.—The term “Spokane Business Council” means the governing body of the Spokane Tribe under the constitution of the Spokane Tribe.

(8) SPOKANE TRIBE.—The term “Spokane Tribe” means the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation, Washington.

#### SEC. 5. PAYMENTS BY ADMINISTRATOR.

(a) INITIAL PAYMENT.—On March 1, 2022, the Administrator shall pay to the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 25 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for fiscal year 2021.

(b) SUBSEQUENT PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2023, and March 1 of each year thereafter through March 1, 2029, the Administrator shall pay the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 25 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for the preceding fiscal year.

(2) MARCH 1, 2030, AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—Not later than March 1, 2030, and March 1 of each year thereafter, the Administrator shall pay the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 32 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for the preceding fiscal year.

#### SEC. 6. TREATMENT AFTER AMOUNTS ARE PAID.

(a) USE OF PAYMENTS.—Payments made to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5 may be used or invested by the Spokane Business Council in

the same manner and for the same purposes as other Spokane Tribe governmental amounts.

(b) NO TRUST RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY.—Neither the Secretary nor the Administrator shall have any trust responsibility for the investment, supervision, administration, or expenditure of any amounts after the date on which the funds are paid to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5.

(c) TREATMENT OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The payments of all amounts to the Spokane Business Council and Spokane Tribe under section 5, and the interest and income generated by those amounts, shall be treated in the same manner as payments under section 6 of the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan Distribution of Judgment Funds Act (100 Stat. 677).

(d) TRIBAL AUDIT.—After the date on which amounts are paid to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5, the amounts shall—

- (1) constitute Spokane Tribe governmental amounts; and
- (2) be subject to an annual tribal government audit.

#### SEC. 7. REPAYMENT CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall deduct from the interest payable to the Secretary of the Treasury from net proceeds (as defined in section 13 of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act (16 U.S.C. 838k))—

- (1) in fiscal year 2030, \$2,700,000; and
- (2) in each subsequent fiscal year in which the Administrator makes a payment under section 5, \$2,700,000.

(b) CREDITING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), each deduction made under this section for the fiscal year shall be—

(A) a credit to the interest payments otherwise payable by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury during the fiscal year in which the deduction is made; and

(B) allocated pro rata to all interest payments on debt associated with the generation function of the Federal Columbia River Power System that are due during the fiscal year.

(2) DEDUCTION GREATER THAN AMOUNT OF INTEREST.—If, in an applicable fiscal year under paragraph (1), the deduction is greater than the amount of interest due on debt associated with the generation function for the fiscal year, the amount of the deduction that exceeds the interest due on debt associated with the generation function shall be allocated pro rata to all other interest payments due during the fiscal year.

(3) CREDIT.—To the extent that a deduction exceeds the total amount of interest described in paragraphs (1) and (2), the deduction shall be applied as a credit against any other payments that the Administrator makes to the Secretary of the Treasury.

#### SEC. 8. EXTINGUISHMENT OF CLAIMS.

On the date that payment under section 5(a) is made to the Spokane Tribe, all monetary claims that the Spokane Tribe has or may have against the United States to a fair share of the annual hydropower revenues generated by the Grand Coulee Dam project for the past and continued use of land of the Spokane Tribe for the production of hydropower at Grand Coulee Dam shall be extinguished.

#### SEC. 9. ADMINISTRATION.

Nothing in this Act establishes any precedent or is binding on the Southwestern Power Administration, Western Area Power Administration, or Southeastern Power Administration.

S. 46

*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 “Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Repeal Act”.

#### SEC. 2. REPEAL.

Public Law 89-224 (commonly known as the “Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act”) (79 Stat. 897) is repealed.

#### SEC. 3. DISBURSEMENT OF REMAINING FUNDS.

Notwithstanding any provision of Public Law 89-224 (79 Stat. 897) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) relating to the distribution or use of funds, as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall disburse to the Klamath Tribe the balance of any funds that, on or before the date of enactment of this Act, were appropriated or deposited into the trust accounts for remaining legal fees and administration and per capita trust accounts, as identified by the Secretary of the Interior, under that Act (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act).

S. 199

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe Reservation Restoration Act”.

#### SEC. 2. LEECH LAKE BAND OF OJIBWE RESERVATION RESTORATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal land described in subsection (b)(1) was taken from members of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe during a period—

- (A) beginning in 1948;
- (B) during which the Bureau of Indian Affairs incorrectly interpreted an order of the Secretary of the Interior to mean that the Department of the Interior had the authority to sell tribal allotments without the consent of a majority of the rightful landowners; and
- (C) ending in 1959, when the Secretary of the Interior was—

(i) advised that sales described in subparagraph (B) were illegal; and

(ii) ordered to cease conducting those sales;

(2) as a result of the Federal land described in subsection (b)(1) being taken from members of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe hold the smallest percentage of its original reservation lands of any Ojibwe bands in Minnesota;

(3)(A) the applicable statute of limitations prohibits individuals from pursuing through litigation the return of the land taken as described in paragraph (1); but

(B) a Federal judge ruled that the land could be restored to the affected individuals through the legislative process;

(4) a comprehensive review of the Federal land demonstrated that—

(A) a portion of the Federal land is encumbered by—

- (i) utility easements;
- (ii) rights-of-way for roads; and
- (iii) flowage and reservoir rights; and
- (B) there are no known cabins, campgrounds, lodges, or resorts located on any portion of the Federal land; and
- (5) on reacquisition by the Tribe of the Federal land, the Tribe—

(A) has pledged to respect the easements, rights-of-way, and other rights described in paragraph (4)(A); and

(B)(i) does not intend immediately to modify the use of the Federal land; but

(ii) will keep the Federal land in tax-exempt fee status as part of the Chippewa Na-

tional Forest until the Tribe develops a plan that allows for a gradual subdivision of some tracts for economic and residential development by the Tribe.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 11,760 acres of Federal land located in the Chippewa National Forest in Cass County, Minnesota, the boundaries of which shall be depicted on the map, and described in the legal description, submitted under subsection (d)(1)(B).

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term “Federal land” includes—

(i) any improvement located on the Federal land described in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) any appurtenance to the Federal land.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe.

(c) TRANSFER TO RESERVATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and paragraph (2), the Secretary shall transfer to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(2) TREATMENT.—Effective immediately on the transfer under paragraph (1), the Federal land shall be—

(A) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(B) considered to be a part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) SURVEY, MAP, AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, complete a plan of survey to establish the boundaries of the Federal land; and

(B) as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a map and legal description of the Federal land to—

- (i) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and
- (ii) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

(2) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description submitted under paragraph (1)(B) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical error in the map or legal description.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description submitted under paragraph (1)(B) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Secretary.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise expressly provided in this section, nothing in this section affects any right or claim of the Tribe, as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, to any land or interest in land.

(2) PROHIBITIONS.—

(A) EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Federal land.

(B) NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.—The Federal land shall not be eligible or used for any gaming activity carried out under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(3) FOREST MANAGEMENT.—Any commercial forestry activity carried out on the Federal land shall be managed in accordance with applicable Federal law.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS MONTH AND NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS DAY**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 220.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 220) designating the month of June 2019 as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month" and June 27, 2019, as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day."

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 220) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 23, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

**ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 28 THROUGH MONDAY, JULY 8, 2019**

Mr. McCONNELL. Now Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 5 a.m., Friday, June 28; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the Senate resume consideration of the Udall amendment No. 883 under the previous order; further, that following disposition of the Udall amendment, the Senate adjourn to then convene for pro forma sessions only with no business being conducted on the following dates and times and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Tuesday, July 2, at 4:45 p.m.; Friday, July 5, at 11:45 a.m.

I further ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, July 5, it next convene at 3 p.m., Monday, July 8, and 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, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Bress nomination; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday, July 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 5 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:10 p.m., recessed until Friday, June 28, 2019, at 5 a.m.

**CONFIRMATIONS**

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 27, 2019:

**PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD**

ADITYA BAMZAI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 29, 2020.

TRAVIS LEBLANC, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 29, 2022.

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

VERONICA DAIGLE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

LANE GENATOWSKI, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

RONALD DOUGLAS JOHNSON, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF EL SALVADOR.

**ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

AIMEE KATHRYN JORJANI, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2021.

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

DAVID MICHAEL SATTERFIELD, OF MISSOURI, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY.

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

CHRISTOPHER SCOLESE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE.

**IN THE NAVY**

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) GENE F. PRICE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) SHAWN E. DUANE

REAR ADM. (LH) SCOTT D. JONES

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN B. MUSTIN

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN A. SCHOMMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) ALAN J. REYES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) TROY M. MCCLELLAND

**IN THE ARMY**

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES A. FLYNN

**IN THE NAVY**

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. MARK E. MORITZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. CHRISTOPHER A. ASSELTA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. MICHAEL T. CURRAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. LESLIE E. REARDANZ III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. KENNETH R. BLACKMON

CAPT. ROBERT C. NOWAKOWSKI

CAPT. THOMAS S. WALL

CAPT. LARRY D. WATKINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. SCOTT K. FULLER

CAPT. MICHAEL J. STEFFEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. PAULA D. DUNN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. PAMELA C. MILLER

**IN THE AIR FORCE**

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be general*

GEN. JOHN W. RAYMOND

**IN THE ARMY**

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be general*

LT. GEN. PAUL J. LACAMERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL E. KURILLA

**IN THE NAVY**

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be vice admiral*

REAR ADM. RICKY L. WILLIAMSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. PHILIP W. YU

**IN THE AIR FORCE**

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

*To be brigadier general*

COL. ARTHUR P. WUNDER

**IN THE ARMY**

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

*To be brigadier general*

COL. WILLIAM GREEN, JR.

**IN THE NAVY**

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:



*To be vice admiral*

VICE ADM. PHILLIP G. SAWYER

## IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

LT. GEN. ERIC P. WENDT

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. MICHAEL R. BERRY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. MICHEL M. RUSSELL, SR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH L. BIEHLER  
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM B. BLAYLOCK II  
BRIG. GEN. THOMAS R. BOUCHARD  
BRIG. GEN. PAUL B. CHAUNCEY III  
BRIG. GEN. JOHANNA P. CLYBORNE  
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM J. EDWARDS  
BRIG. GEN. LEE M. ELLIS  
BRIG. GEN. PABLO ESTRADA, JR.  
BRIG. GEN. LAPTHE C. FLORA  
BRIG. GEN. TROY D. GALLOWAY  
BRIG. GEN. LEE W. HOPKINS  
BRIG. GEN. MARVIN T. HUNT  
BRIG. GEN. MARK C. JACKSON  
BRIG. GEN. RICHARD F. JOHNSON  
BRIG. GEN. TIM C. LAWSON  
BRIG. GEN. KEVIN D. LYONS  
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL A. MITCHELL  
BRIG. GEN. MICHEL A. NATALI  
BRIG. GEN. CHAD J. PARKER  
BRIG. GEN. GREGORY C. PORTER  
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY D. SMILEY  
BRIG. GEN. DAVID N. VESPER

## IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. HUAN T. NGUYEN

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GARY B. BURMAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

WILLIAM D. HYSLOP, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

RANDALL P. HUFF, OF WYOMING, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

ROBERT WALLACE, OF WYOMING, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE.

## PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD

EDWARD W. FELTEN, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 29, 2025.

## IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS JOSEPH ALFORD AND ENDING WITH GABRIEL MATTHEW YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ELBERT R. ALFORD IV AND ENDING WITH TRACIE L. SWINGLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF CATHERINE M. TOLVO, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTIAN F. COOPER AND ENDING WITH RYAN E. SNYDER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEITH A. BERRY AND ENDING WITH STEVEN P. ROGERS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HASSAN N. BATAYNEH AND ENDING WITH ASAD U. QAMAR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON A. KOSKINEN AND ENDING WITH ROBIN T. BINGHAM, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2019.

## IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON BULLOCK AND ENDING WITH DEMETRES WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JULIE A. AKE AND ENDING WITH D013176, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SHANE R. REEVES, TO BE COLONEL.  
ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALWYNMICHAEL S. ALBANO AND ENDING WITH STANTON D. TROTTER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON B. ALISANGCO AND ENDING WITH D014026, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL M. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH MIAO X. ZHOU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GLENN N. JUMAN AND ENDING WITH RUSSELL T. MCNEAR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CARMEN Y. SALCEDO, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RUSSELL F. DUBOSE AND ENDING WITH TIMOTHY D. FORREST, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. BALLARD AND ENDING WITH D015102, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ANDRE L. THOMAS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF D013839, TO BE MAJOR.  
ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER B. NETTLES, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EDWARD C. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH G010558, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLES M. ABEYAWARDENA AND ENDING WITH G010449, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN R. ABELLA AND ENDING WITH D014810, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF SHAWN E. MCGOWAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF MICHAEL R. LUKKES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JAMES Y. MALONE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

## IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW P. BEARE AND ENDING WITH KEITH A. TUKES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD L. BOSWORTH AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW C. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LANE C. ASKEW AND ENDING WITH DONALD V. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK A. ANGELO AND ENDING WITH GREGORY E. SUTTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH REX A. BOONYOBHAS AND ENDING WITH SARAH E. ZARRO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT DRAYTON AND ENDING WITH THOMAS R. WAGENER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEITH ARCHIBALD AND ENDING WITH DAVID C. WEBBER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MITCHELL W. ALBIN AND ENDING WITH TODD D. ZENTNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ADRIAN Z. BEJAR AND ENDING WITH ROBERT A. WOODRUFF III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE

AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIN E. O. ACOSTA AND ENDING WITH CHRISTI S. MONTGOMERY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DERECK C. BROWN AND ENDING WITH SHERRY W. WANGWHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM H. CLINTON AND ENDING WITH SARAH T. SELPKYLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES M. BELMONT AND ENDING WITH JON M. HERSEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL R. BRUNEAU AND ENDING WITH HANS L. HOLKON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL C. CABASSA AND ENDING WITH ALLAN J. SANDOR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIN G. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH IAN L. VALERIO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL E. HALL AND ENDING WITH DARREN L. STENNETT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LILLIAN A. ABUAN AND ENDING WITH CHARLES M. TELLIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VIRGINIA S. BLACKMAN AND ENDING WITH ABIGAIL M. YABLONSKY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN J. ELLIS, JR. AND ENDING WITH SYLVAIN W. WONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ZIAD T. ABOONA AND ENDING WITH LISA A. WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RUBEN D. ACOSTA AND ENDING WITH LUKE A. ZABROCKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID L. BELL, JR. AND ENDING WITH HAROLD S. ZALD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM R. BUTLER AND ENDING WITH OMARR E. TOBIAS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN J. HALL AND ENDING WITH PHILLIP E. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ESTHER A. BOPP AND ENDING WITH ROBERTA S. TAYLOR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRECHELL I. LEACHMAN AND ENDING WITH LEE V. K. STUART, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEREMY T. CASELLA AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH M. ZACK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FREDERICK G. ALEGRE AND ENDING WITH KENNETH B. WOOSTER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MIGUEL A. CASTELLANOS AND ENDING WITH KEVIN A. SCHNITTKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLOTTE A. BROWNING AND ENDING WITH RACHEL H. WADEBROWN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JULIE M. BARR AND ENDING WITH JACOB S. WIEMANN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LIAM M. APOSTOL AND ENDING WITH ANN M. VALLANDINGHAM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY L. LACOURSE AND ENDING WITH SHANNON C.

ZAHUMENSKY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT A. HIGGINS AND ENDING WITH PEIHUA KU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NATHANIEL A. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH LEONARD N. WALKER IV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID K. BOYLAN AND ENDING WITH NED L. SWANSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ONOFRIO P. MARGIONI AND ENDING WITH KURT D. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID L. BACHELOR AND ENDING WITH THOMAS J. TAYLOR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW M. COOK AND ENDING WITH DENIZ M. PISKIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTINA M. ALLEE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DAVID A. SCHUBKEGEL, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JON B. VOIGTLANDER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH REBEKAH R. JOHNSON AND ENDING WITH ROBERT S. THOMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW A. BUCH AND ENDING WITH TROY J. SHERRILL, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MEGER D. CHAPPELL, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RYAN D. SCULLY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRANDON T. BRIDGES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MARK S. JAVATE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHANDLER W. JONES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JUSTIN R. TAYLOR, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KRISTINE N. BENCH AND ENDING WITH DAVID A. ZIEMBA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DIEGO F. ALVARADO AND ENDING WITH JARED M. WILHELM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY J. FALVO IV AND ENDING WITH BRIAN T. WIERZBICKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BECKY L. BUJAKI AND ENDING WITH NICHOLAS T. WALKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALBERT E. ARNOLD IV AND ENDING WITH JAMES F. WRIGHTSON, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN J. BANAZWSKI AND ENDING WITH EVAN B. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHANE L. BEAVERS AND ENDING WITH JOHN J. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LEVI DESJARLAIS AND ENDING WITH ANTHONY R. MURPHY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MEEERA CHEERHARAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF SELINA D. BANDY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT W. BOASE AND ENDING WITH WALTER J. ZAFF III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATE W. AERANDIR AND ENDING WITH REBECCA L. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HANNAH L. BEALON AND ENDING WITH BILLY W. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIELLE L. ADAMOVICH AND ENDING WITH CHELSEY L. ZWICKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN I. ACTKINSON AND ENDING WITH GEORGE S. ZINTAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MARTIN E. ROBERTS, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TODD W. GEYER AND ENDING WITH ANTHONY J. SMOLA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2019.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING ELLEN CRAIN OF  
BUTTE

**HON. GREG GIANFORTE**

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Ellen Crain of Butte for her 29 years of service as the Director of the Butte-Silver Bow Public Archives and for transforming the public archives into a renowned source of research and community pride.

Ellen, a native of Butte, began her work as director of the archives in 1990. She immediately set out to acquire additional collections of historical documents, maps, books, and articles. Outgrowing their current location, the old Butte Fire Station No. 1, Ellen led an expansion project in 2007. Butte-Silver Bow voters overwhelmingly supported her efforts and passed a \$7.5 million bond for the archives.

The project included the renovation of the historic fire department station that had been home to the archives since 1981, and an expansion of two archival vaults and a community meeting space.

Under Ellen's leadership, the Butte-Silver Bow Public Archives has become a recognized source for research. Approximately 5,000 academic and family historians visit each year from all over the world. The community room is a busy place with bi-weekly brown bag lunches attracting large audiences and well-known speakers. Outreach efforts include workshops on preserving family archives and connecting with various ethnic populations in the community.

"Butte has had such a historic impact" said Ellen. "Much of the copper that electrified the country came from Butte. Hand-in-hand with that is the historic contributions to organized labor from a diverse ethnic population. It is such an honor for me and my staff to represent Butte. We are always uncovering new ways to look at old stories."

Madam Speaker, for her leadership and dedication to preserving Montana's historic impact on the country and the world, I recognize Ellen Crain for her spirit of Montana.

IN HONOR OF NATIONAL  
SUNGLASSES DAY

**HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Sunglasses Day and the importance of eye protection in the summer and throughout the year.

Unprotected exposure to UV rays may lead to serious vision problems including short-term issues such as sensitivity to light, trouble seeing, sunburn of the eyes or eyelids, irritated eyes, and red or swollen eyes—in addition to

serious long-term issues. Thankfully, this damage can be prevented. Manufacturers and suppliers in Texas and around the country that provide sunglasses with UVA/UVB protective lenses are helping to equip Americans to protect their eyes.

In the case of eye care, prevention through protection is critical. As a physician, I commend the Vision Council for its work to educate Americans on the importance of healthy vision. On National Sunglasses Day, we are reminded that everyone can take easy steps to protect our eyes.

INTERNATIONAL MOTOR SPORTS  
ASSOCIATION (IMSA)

**HON. MICHAEL WALTZ**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, since the 1940s, Daytona Beach has been the premiere destination for auto racing.

Fifty years ago, Bill France, Sr. and John and Peggy Bishop laid a foundation that today supports one of the most prominent auto racing organizations in the world—the International Motor Sports Association. What began as a sanctioning body for a Formula Ford and Formula Vee race at Pocono Raceway has grown to become an international powerhouse specializing in world-class sports car competition.

This year, IMSA, based in Daytona Beach, turns 50. It comes from humble beginnings. The IMSA started as a race with fewer than 330 attendees has expanded by leaps and bounds over the last 50 years now boasts some of the largest attendance numbers in its history.

Here in my district, we understand the excitement and the benefits of our car racing. IMSA has been an important piece of our community, debuting its Grand-Am road racing circuit in 2000 at Daytona.

This year, the IMSA will lead seven motor-sports platforms and deliver live coverage to racing fans all over the world.

It's an honor to recognize the IMSA and their contributions to our district and the racing community. I'd like to congratulate them on 50 years worth being proud of. Here's to many more.

IN SUPPORT OF THE SHERRILL  
AMENDMENT NO. 191 TO H.R. 3055

**HON. MIKIE SHERRILL**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, today I rise today in support of the en-bloc amendment, and to thank the Interior and Environment Appropriations Subcommittee Chair-

woman, Ms. McCOLLUM, for including the Sherrill Amendment No. 191 in the en-bloc package.

My amendment ensures that the EPA will continue to provide adequate funding, \$8 million, for the Children's Environmental Health and Disease Prevention Research Centers.

The Children's Centers have made profound contributions to our scientific understanding of how exposures to chemicals and pollutants uniquely impact children and pregnant women. Researchers working in the Children's Centers study how environmental exposures are linked to adverse health outcomes such as poor birth outcomes, behavioral and learning deficits, respiratory issues, and childhood cancers.

All children deserve a healthy environment where they can grow and thrive. It is imperative that we support the research necessary to understand how our environment impacts children and families' health and wellbeing.

I am concerned that the grants that currently fund thirteen Children's Centers are set to expire in July and that no announcement has been made to indicate renewed funding. To ensure that these valuable programs can continue, I am offering an amendment and asking the House of Representative to vote in strong support of the Children's Centers and their important work.

I thank Interior and Environment Appropriations Subcommittee Chairwoman McCOLLUM and Ranking Member JOYCE for their leadership in adopting this important provision.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE,  
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPRO-  
PRIATIONS ACT, 2020

SPEECH OF

**HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, June 24, 2019*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes:

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chair, as many of bridges across the nation are reaching the end of their useful lives, it is important for the Department to prioritize funding for the design of new structures needed to replace these out of date and outmoded bridges. This is most critical for bridges that constitute essential components of evacuation routes, such as our two Cape Cod bridges. When these structures are owned by the United States Government, we have both a legal and a moral responsibility to ensure that they are adequate to the demands put upon them.

In my district, nearly 250,000 of my constituents live on the peninsula of Cape Cod and the Islands of Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket. In the event of an emergency, these citizens' only available evacuation route is

• 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.

over the Cape Cod Canal bridges. The Canal bridges were completed in 1935 and 1938. They were constructed for the age of the Model T, and not the age of the SUV.

The Canal bridges are now insufficient for the needs of the Cape and Islands community. The lanes on the bridges are too narrow, and do not reflect current federal highway standards. They lack a breakdown lane that could be used for additional road space in an emergency. With the Canal bridges in their current state on a busy summer weekend, the traffic can back up for miles. During an evacuation scenario, this congestion would be far worse and pose a real risk to public safety.

The Cape Cod Canal bridges have reached the end of their useful lives, and modern replacements for them will be needed within the next several years. Replacement bridges must be designed soon so that the United States Government can live up to its responsibility to provide transit for Cape Cod residents and visitors over the Cape Cod Canal—especially in the event of an emergency.

The Canal bridges, and projects like them across the nation, need funding to support them through the costly design phase. Without designs in hand, it is impossible for transportation planners to precisely estimate the scope of work and costs of replacing this aging infrastructure so they can move forward towards construction. That is why my amendment is so important not only for our community, but communities like ours around the country.

HONORING JOHN JOSEPH  
MANFREDA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember John Joseph Manfreda for his lifelong belief in and staunch commitment to exceptional public service.

Born in Washington, DC, Mr. Manfreda received his undergraduate degree in business finance and economics from the University of Maryland. He earned his law degree from the American University School of Law in 1970 and earned a master's degree in tax law from Georgetown University Law Center in 1974. Mr. Manfreda began his almost 50-year career in public service at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF) Counsel Office and its Internal Revenue Service predecessor. From 1999 to 2003, he served as Chief Counsel for ATF. Mr. Manfreda was integral to the founding of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB). He served TTB as the Deputy Administrator before being appointed to the Administrator of the Bureau in 2005.

Mr. Manfreda was widely respected for his knowledge, fairness, and honesty by his colleagues and those he worked with in the industry he regulated. He helped write many alcohol laws when he served as Counsel for ATF and retained the information about those laws. He was a fair man and was always willing to listen. Mr. Manfreda was an honorable man of character who valued honesty and demonstrated that value. Mr. Manfreda was recognized for his important work with the Meritorious and Distinguished Presidential

Rank Awards and the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms.

Madam Speaker, John Joseph Manfreda was a dedicated public servant who held the sincere belief in the good of public service. He inspired his coworkers and was a friend and mentor to all who knew him and a devoted family man to his wife, children, and grandchildren. It is therefore fitting and proper that we remember the life and honor the service of John Joseph Manfreda here today.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE USCGC "MACKINAW" IN CHEBOYGAN, MICHIGAN

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the 75th anniversary of the United States Coast Guard Cutter *Mackinaw*, based out of Cheboygan, Michigan.

The original Icebreaker *Mackinaw* (WAGB-83) was constructed during World War II to facilitate winter shipping over the Great Lakes and maintain year-round war-time production of steel. Cheboygan served as her home port as she played this critical role. After more than 62 years of outstanding service facilitating commerce in support of the economy and security of the entire nation, the original *Mackinaw* was decommissioned in 2006 and replaced with the USCGC *Mackinaw* (WLBB-30). Performing the same critical icebreaking role as her namesake, the *Mackinaw* also serves year-round as an Aids to Navigation ship and conducts law enforcement, search and rescue, and environmental emergency response missions. Its unique design makes it exceptionally maneuverable and capable of breaking smooth ice up to 42 inches thick. Since the first ship was launched 75 years ago, the impact of the *Mackinaw* on economy and security of Michigan and the entire country cannot be overstated.

The anniversary celebration for the *Mackinaw* will take place as a part of the 8th Annual Michigan Waterways festival, a 4-day community celebration of the Michigan Inland Waterway and Northern Michigan, running from June 27th to the 30th.

Madam Speaker, the celebration of the 8th Annual Waterways Festival is the perfect opportunity for us to appreciate the history and service of the USCGC *Mackinaw* and her crew. Michiganders can take immense pride in knowing that the First District is home to such an important vessel. On behalf of my constituents, I wish the *Mackinaw*, her crew, and the city of Cheboygan all the best in their future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday June 26, 2019, I wasn't able to vote due to a family emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 415; NAY on Roll Call No. 416; YEA on Roll Call No. 417; YEA on Roll Call No. 418; and YEA on Roll Call No. 419.

COMMANDER JAMES B. MILLS

HON. KEVIN HERN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, this week, I welcomed to my office a family of constituents in town to celebrate the life and legacy of a fallen war hero at Arlington National Cemetery.

The Geiger family traveled here to honor the life of their relative Commander James B. Mills, who died more than 50 years ago while serving in the Navy.

Commander Mills' plane disappeared from radar just past midnight on September 21, 1966. No distress call was heard, no one saw the plane go down, and extensive aerial searches yielded no clues as to what happened to Commander Mills and his copilot James Bauder.

For more than 50 years, Commander Mills' family had no closure on his loss, until about a year ago when his remains were found off the coast of Vietnam.

This week, Commander Mills was honored with a burial at the Arlington National Cemetery attended by more than 300 people who came to celebrate his life and finally put Commander Mills to rest in his home country as the hero he is. Commander Mills and his loved ones have found peace at last.

CARIBBEAN AMERICAN HERITAGE

HON. STACEY E. PLASKETT

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 2019

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, as Americans begin many of the pastimes of summer that are quintessentially American—baseball, backyard barbecues, family road trips—Caribbean Americans spend the month of June reflecting on their contributions and melded cultures in the United States.

Congress adopted H. Con. Res. 71 which established the Caribbean American Heritage month, sponsored by Congresswoman Barbara Lee and signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2006. "Whereas people of Caribbean heritage are found in every State of the Union . . ." is the first line of the U.S. House of Representatives' resolution to establish a Caribbean American Heritage month. While the Act establishing Caribbean American Heritage month emphasized the present influence of Caribbean Americans, American history would not be complete without the integration and support of Caribbean people. From America's founding to the present, Caribbean people have supported and assisted in the creation of a collective American identity—the articulation of the nation's rightful place in the world, its traditions, its language and cultural style.

Despite being ostracized and alienated by many of his contemporaries for his Caribbean

roots—but for Alexander Hamilton's contribution to our military, creation of our banking system and assistance in drafting the Constitution—our country would not be as strong today as it is. From American Revolution Haitian gens de couleur libre (free men of color) fighting troops, slave revolt leader Denmark Vessey to Colin Powell's shock and awe doctrine, the Caribbean emphasis on revolutionary and righteous principles enforced through martial force.

The Caribbean is a melting pot of different races, cultures, ethnicities, and languages; it is the southern reflection of the American experience. Caribbean Americans like all who come to this country desire to make themselves and this country better.

DEPUTY SHERIFF MATTHEW MORENO

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the dedication and sacrifice of a fallen Deputy Sheriff, Matthew Moreno.

A resident of Trinidad, Colorado, Matthew proudly served his community as a full-time Deputy Sheriff in Las Animas County. He also worked part-time as an Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) for the Trinidad Ambulance District. In Matthew's free time, he volunteered as a firefighter—quickly rising to the rank of Fire Captain.

On December 12, 2018, Matthew was struck by an impaired driver while responding to a domestic disturbance call. Tragically, he did not survive the accident.

Our nation owes a debt of gratitude to our police, fire fighters, and first responders, especially our fallen heroes. Matthew's commitment to serving others exceeded expectations, and his willingness to put his life on the line to protect others will never be forgotten. On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my deepest gratitude for Matthew's service and deepest condolences to his family, friends, and the entire community that undoubtedly feels his loss.

Madam Speaker, it is an honor to recognize the life of Deputy Sheriff Matthew Moreno for his commitment to family, community, and the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING THE CUMBERLAND CONTAINER CORPORATION'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN W. ROSE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Cumberland Container Corporation in honor of its 50th anniversary.

A time-honored mainstay of Putnam County, Cumberland Container Corporation was granted its corporate charter by the State of Tennessee on October 21, 1968. Nine months later, this company planted its roots in a 6,000-square-foot building in Monterey, Ten-

nessee. At its commencement, this company served the area by providing manufacturing containers and packaging materials to local businesses with nothing more than four pieces of used equipment and six employees.

Cumberland Container Corporation was dedicated to its belief in efficiently supplying local companies. Although times proved to be tough at the beginning, this company persevered and demonstrated the brilliance of this concept through consistent customer growth over the last five decades.

Fast forward to this year, Cumberland Container Corporation is currently operating in a 260,000-square-foot building on over 18 acres of land. By current count, Cumberland Container Corporation now employs 85 associates and owns a vast assortment of machinery for its production and logistical needs.

To my House colleagues here today, I hope that you will join me in recognizing the Cumberland Container Corporation for their longstanding service to the community. It is the hardworking nature of this company and its employees that truly reflect exactly what it means to be a Tennessean.

CELEBRATING THE CAREER OF DR. EDWARD J. LUKOMSKI AT PATHWAYS, INC.

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the service of Dr. Edward J. Lukomski to Pathways, Inc. and congratulate him on his retirement.

For the last sixteen years, Dr. Ed Lukomski has served as the President and Chief Executive Officer of Pathways, Inc. which provides services to two thousand people in fifteen counties. Pathways, Inc. is a not-for-profit human service organization offering in-home, community, and foster care services to youth with serious emotional disturbances, intellectual and developmental disabilities, and chronic medical conditions. Under Ed's leadership, Pathways has grown exponentially, not only in services and programs offered, but also geographically in their area of service coverage. Ed's dedication and hard work has ensured the expansion of opportunities for youths in need of aid, and for that we must commend him.

To recognize his outstanding service, Pathways will be dedicating their Broad Street facility in Horseheads, New York, in his honor. The newly renamed "Lukomski Center" will stand as a fitting tribute to Ed's legacy as Pathways continues his work to expand services to youths in need.

As Ed moves forward with the next chapter of his life, we applaud his tireless efforts to help youth in our communities and we wish him all the best in his retirement.

Given the above, I ask that this Legislative Body pause in its deliberations and join me to celebrate Ed Lukomski and his extraordinary career.

COLONEL SETH KRUMMRICH RELINQUISHES COMMAND OF THE FORT IRWIN GARRISON

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of U.S. Army Colonel Seth Krummrich, who will relinquish command of the Fort Irwin Garrison on June 27, 2019. Colonel Krummrich is leaving for his next duty assignment as the Chief of Staff, Special Operations Command Central (SOCCENT) at MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa, Florida.

Since Colonel Krummrich assumed command of the Fort Irwin Garrison, I have been impressed by his hard work on behalf of the Army. During his command, Colonel Krummrich oversaw the completion of Weed Army Community Hospital, a \$211 million improvement designed to bring medical facilities at the garrison into the 21st century. In addition to the successful completion of the hospital, Colonel Krummrich has worked closely with my staff and I on several proposed projects to further improve Fort Irwin and better support the Army's critical training mission. While these projects were not completed during his tenure, his hard work has laid the foundation for their future success.

In addition to thanking Colonel Krummrich for his service at Fort Irwin, I would also like to recognize his outstanding military career. Colonel Krummrich is a combat veteran with numerous deployments to both Iraq and Afghanistan, including participating in the initial invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 as a member of the 5th Special Forces Group (Airborne). His service on the battlefield is complimented by his impressive educational background, where he was most recently a senior Military Fellow at Stanford University. While I wish him the best at SOCCENT, I will miss the passion, energy, and determination that he brought to the Fort Irwin Garrison.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MAC THORBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 2019

Mr. THORBERRY. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, June 25, 2019, I was unable to be in Washington and missed roll call votes No. 403 "Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 460—The combined rule providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 2722—Securing America's Federal Elections Act and of the bill H.R. 3351—Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2020," No. 404 "Adoption of H. Res. 460—The combined rule providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 2722—Securing America's Federal Elections Act and of the bill H.R. 3351—Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2020," No. 405 "Banks (R-IN)—Amendment No. 251—Reduces amounts made available in Division E, Other than amounts made available to the Department of Defense by 14 percent," and No. 406 "Jayapal (D-WA)—Amendment No. 268—Reallocates \$1,000,000

to fund transitional housing and homelessness services.” Had I been present, I would have voted “NO, NO, YES, NO” on these bills, respectively .

IN HONOR OF W.S. EVERETT

**HON. BRETT GUTHRIE**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Wilson Spencer “W.S.” Everett of Glasgow, Kentucky. Mr. Everett was a proud patriot throughout his life, serving in the Kentucky National Guard and the United States Army during the Korean War.

For the last 30 years, Mr. Everett dedicated his time to honor the legacies of his fellow soldiers, whether through his involvement with the Glasgow chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, or his regular participation with the Chapter 20 Color Guard. Mr. Everett also designed two memorials in my district: the Hiseville Veterans Memorial and the Glasgow-Barren County Veterans Wall of Honor. His dedication to this endeavor was so great that even in his final days, Mr. Everett went to the Wall of Honor to install the final veteran’s title.

Today, I join with Mr. Everett’s family in remembering the legacy that he left behind. He is truly an American patriot that strived to live his life in honor of each fold of the flag and I am grateful for his service not only to the country, but also to his community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MT. PLEASANT BAPTIST CHURCH

**HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to rise today to celebrate Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church’s 100th Anniversary and recognize it for its numerous contributions to the greater Kansas City area. I am truly honored to have this house of worship and pillar of faith in my Congressional District.

Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church is in Kansas City’s historic 18th and Vine District, a neighborhood critical to the life and development of the African American community. In the 1920s, 18th and Vine began to grow, becoming a creative hub of African American culture and shaping the future of Kansas City for the better. Founded in 1919, Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church was crucial to this cultural renaissance. Churches throughout this period were centers of community and support. They provided members hope and encouragement in the face of seemingly hopeless challenges like inequality, discrimination, and segregation. For a century, Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church has been a vehicle for social justice and change within Kansas City’s African American community.

Today, churches continue to be a keeper of cultural tradition, a center of storytelling, and the core of African American community. As writer Shauntae Brown White wrote, “Story-

telling that connects is an act of resonance that fulfills the second tenant of Afrocentric discourse, creating harmony in the midst of chaos.” For the past 100 years, the congregation of Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church has produced some of the brightest leaders, innovators, thinkers, and artists in Missouri’s Fifth Congressional District.

Today, Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church serves as a spiritual anchor within the Kansas City community. The church transforms the lives of its members for the better, unites people of all ages and supports them as they seek to live according to the teachings of Jesus Christ. For the past thirty-three years, Pastor L. Henderson Bell has led the church to be a house of hope for those facing adversity in the community. Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church not only is a center of spiritual development but a hub of service in its community, embodying James 2:17’s assertion that, “Faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead.” The church serves the poor and marginalized members of the community by reaching out to them and providing educational opportunities, Bible study classes, health and scholarship trainings, and programs for music and dance.

Mt. Pleasant Baptist has been and continues to be an advocate for the underserved and a champion of the faithful in Kansas City. Its century worth of contributions to the soul of Missouri’s Fifth Congressional District are worthy of praise and recognition. Madam Speaker, please join me in celebrating and honoring Pastor L. Henderson Bell and the congregation of Mt. Pleasant Baptist Church, both past and present, for achieving this milestone.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. JACKIE WALORSKI**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday June 26, 2019, I wasn’t able to vote due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on rollcall No. 420; Yea on rollcall No. 421; Yea on rollcall No. 422; Yea on rollcall No. 423, and Nay on rollcall No. 424.

HONORING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE SISTERS OF SAINT FRANCIS OF TIFFIN

**HON. JIM JORDAN**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I am honored to commend to the House the outstanding work of the Sisters of Saint Francis of Tiffin, Ohio, who are marking 150 years of selfless service to others.

The Tiffin Franciscans were founded by Father Joseph L. Bihn and Mrs. Elizabeth Schaefer (Sister Mary Francis) in the wake of the Civil War to care for the needs of orphans and the elderly. The work of the sisters continues to be rooted in the words of Matthew’s Gospel: “Whatever you did to one of the least of these My brethren, you did to Me.”

Throughout the years, the sisters have devoted themselves to the Franciscan values of

caring for the poor and for all of God’s creation. Dedicated to spreading the message of the Gospel, they have served countless people through their evangelization, education, child care, foster care, and other vital ministries designed to meet the needs of the Tiffin community and far beyond.

Madam Speaker, the Sisters of Saint Francis are marking their sesquicentennial with events and commemorations throughout the year. On behalf of the people of Ohio’s Fourth Congressional District, I am pleased to join in the accolades to them as they celebrate this milestone. They have my best wishes and my thanks for their tireless service to others.

HONORING JAMES SCORDO FOR OVER THREE DECADES OF SERVICE TO THE NORTH COUNTRY AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CREDO COMMUNITY CENTER FOR THE TREATMENT OF ADDICTIONS

**HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor James “Jim” Scordo for over three decades of service to the North Country as Executive Director of Credo Community Center for the Treatment of Addictions.

Jim Scordo has shepherded the community center through good and bad times since 1988 when he helped the center recover from a devastating fire. Jim sought help from his community and graciously raised over \$175,000 dollars to rebuild. When the community center opened its substance abuse outpatient clinic, he was named its first Executive Director. Since then, countless North Country residents have found help overcoming addiction and there are many families in Jefferson County and beyond that are grateful to Jim, his staff, and volunteers for their loved one’s health and wellbeing.

The hands on, local efforts of Credo Community Center and similar centers throughout the country is crucial in the broader fight against the opioid epidemic. Communities need dedicated leadership to ensure that those services remain consistently available for those who need them most. On behalf of New York’s 21st Congressional District, I want to thank Jim for his leadership and service to the North Country and wish him the best in the next chapter.

CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GRAND HOTEL’S DESIGNATION AS A NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK

**HON. JACK BERGMAN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the Grand Hotel upon the occasion of its 30th anniversary as a National Historic Landmark. Through its extraordinary history, cultural significance, and commitment to excellence, the Grand Hotel has become an indispensable part of Michigan’s First District.

The National Historic Landmark system was created in 1935 to recognize structures that are of outstanding historical significance, icons of ideals that shaped the nation, and pristine examples of design or construction. There is no other landmark more deserving of this designation than the Grand Hotel. First opened in 1887, the hotel was created to serve as a retreat for vacationers looking to enjoy summer on Lake Huron. Over the next 132 years, the Grand Hotel would grow to become not only a beloved part of Michigan, but a prominent feature in popular culture and premier destination for visitors from around the world. Its unique design has been widely acclaimed, and its world's-largest 660-foot porch has been enjoyed by everyone from John F. Kennedy and Gerald Ford to Thomas Edison and Mark Twain. The National Park Service designated the hotel as a National Historic Landmark in 1989, citing its historic architecture and representation of the American dream of a "summer place." Today, its role as a summer place remains stronger than ever for thousands of guests to Mackinac Island every year.

Madam Speaker, the celebration of the Grand Hotel's 30th anniversary as a National Historic Landmark is the perfect opportunity for us to appreciate its unique history, cultural impact, and significance to Mackinac Island, Michigan, and the United States. Michiganders can take immense pride in knowing that the First District is home to such an important landmark. On behalf of my constituents, I wish the Grand Hotel all the best in its future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE TRADITION OF THE DOOR COUNTY DAIRY BREAKFAST

**HON. MIKE GALLAGHER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tradition of the Door County Dairy Breakfast, held in Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin.

The Dairy Breakfast is an iconic Door County tradition that provides the community an opportunity to learn about the significant role the dairy industry plays in Wisconsin's economy. Community members meet dairy farmers, learn about the dairy industry, and enjoy delicious Door County coffee and pancakes.

I am grateful to the Sevastopol Future Farmers of America Alumni Association for organizing the 38th Annual Dairy Breakfast in Door County. Their work to recruit sponsors and volunteers is integral to the success of this terrific event. Throughout the year, the Sevastopol FFA Alumni Association provides educational opportunities to the community to increase awareness of Wisconsin's dairy industry and the products produced by area dairy farmers. All proceeds from the Door County Dairy Breakfast go toward scholarships for current FFA high school seniors.

Madam Speaker, I urge all members of this body to join me in commending the efforts of the Door County Dairy Breakfast to educate the community through this time-honored tradition. Thank you to the Sevastopol FFA Alumni Association and the countless sponsors and volunteers for their continued support of Wisconsin's dairy industry.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. STEPHEN'S COMMUNITY HOUSE

**HON. JOYCE BEATTY**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 100th Anniversary of St. Stephen's Community House.

Located in the heart of my district, St. Stephen's Community House is a sanctuary of education, development, and faith serving the Linden Community for 100 years.

Today, under the leadership of CEO, Marilyn Mehaffie; LaTisha Addo, Director of Family Services; and Kristin Giger, Director of Youth Services, St. Stephen's provides services for residents of all ages, ranging from infant mortality initiatives and early childcare programs to vital family and senior services including sustainability efforts and eliminating food deserts.

Even after a century, St. Stephen's Community House's mission of dedicated service to the families of the Linden community continues to thrive, and for that the entire Third Congressional District of Ohio is forever grateful.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT HOME RULE ACT

**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment Home Rule Act. This bill would give the District of Columbia the authority to appoint all members of the D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment (Board), except when the Board is performing functions regarding an application by a foreign mission with respect to a chancery. The Board issues special exceptions, or variances, to the regulations issued by the D.C. Zoning Commission (Commission). This bill does not alter the authority of the Board.

Like every other jurisdiction in the United States, the District should be free to set its own local land-use policies. As the District continues to contend with rapid population growth and economic development, it is more important than ever that the members of the Board are accountable to District residents and local elected officials.

Under current law, in general, the Board consists of a representative each from the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) and the Commission, each of whom may be a federal official, and three mayoral appointees, subject to D.C. Council approval. The Board has no authority over federal property.

Under current law, when the Board is performing functions regarding an application by a foreign mission with respect to the location, expansion or replacement of a chancery, the Board consists of the Executive Director of NCPC; the Director of the National Park Service, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior or the Administrator of General Services, as designated by the President; and

the three mayoral appointees. This bill does not change this composition.

This is an important step to recognize and increase home rule for the District, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. SADIE NELSON

**HON. JENNIFER WEXTON**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Sadie Pike Nelson from Virginia's 10th Congressional District for her 70th birthday on June 24, 2019. Ms. Nelson is an active member within the 10th Congressional District which includes her accomplishments within the Frederick County School system, United Methodist Women, and Winchester Lioness Lions Club.

I commend Ms. Nelson on her lifetime pursuit of community activism. After moving to Winchester, VA in 1980, Ms. Nelson became a teacher with the special education program at the Robert E. Aylor Middle School, where she taught for 25 years. She then became the Assistant Principal for Admiral Richard E. Byrd Middle School for seven years before retiring with 32 years in education all together. Ms. Nelson was the first African American Administrator in the history of Frederick County Public Schools.

Ms. Nelson joined the John Mann United Methodist Church in 1985. She is presently the Administrative Chairman of the church council, President of the United Methodist Women, and President of the Usher Board. She has also served as the Spiritual Growth Coordinator for the Winchester District of United Methodist Women for a total of five years. Outside of the church, Ms. Nelson was the first African American to be invited to join the Winchester Lioness Club where she served as president in 2005, 2006, 2011, 2018, and 2019. Through this organization she strives to make a difference in women's lives with philanthropies that include ownership of a two-year woman's college and five programs that provide higher educational assistance through scholarships and loans for women to continue their education.

Ms. Nelson is also the proud mother of one daughter, proud grandmother of four granddaughters, and proud great-grandmother of a set of twin great-granddaughters and four great-grandsons.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing and applauding Ms. Sadie Pike Nelson on her accomplishments and wish her the best for her 70th birthday celebration.

RECOGNIZING STAFF SERGEANT STANLEY NANCE

**HON. BEN McADAMS**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. McADAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Staff Sergeant Stanley Nance.

In May 1944, 1,100 U.S. military men joined ranks to form what would be called “the Ghost Army.”

Composed largely of artists, this unit had unusual orders: not to avoid detection by enemy forces, but to actively attract attention through an ingenious optical illusion.

One of them was Staff Sergeant Stanley Nance, signal Company Special of the 23rd Headquarters Special Troops.

The Ghost Army’s tactics were to impersonate other Allied units, using inflatable tanks and jeeps made of sticks and burlap, to make the enemy believe that large factions of soldiers were on Omaha Beach and surrounding areas, after D-Day.

Massive speakers were mounted to the back of military vehicles, blasting the ambient noises of a much larger unit. They sounded like they were coming from the battlefield, but in fact had been recorded months before in fort Knox, Kentucky.

Kept a secret until 1985, the story of the Ghost Army and those in its ranks serves as a heroic tale of young Americans’ bold actions to defend freedom.

Decades later, Staff Sergeant Nance’s great-granddaughter, Madeline Christianson, told his story through a history project, which recently won the World War II History Award at the National History Competition. Her project is an amazing re-creation of a story of skill, courage and triumph—unique in the annals of history.

As we prepare to celebrate Independence Day 2019, we honor two extraordinary generations of Utahns—the soldier who helped defeat tyranny during World War II, and his great-granddaughter who is keeping the story of heroism alive.

SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT NO. 35  
TO H.R. 3055

**HON. JOE COURTNEY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment numbered 35 to Division A of H.R. 3055 to direct the National Institutes of Standards and Technologies to establish standards for pyrrhotite in concrete aggregate. Pyrrhotite is a mineral that unfortunately has been mixed into concrete aggregate and is widespread in concrete foundations and residential commercial municipal buildings in Connecticut and Massachusetts, and parts of Quebec, Canada, that after exposure to moisture, causes the material to premature crumbling and collapse because of rusting.

Estimates are as high as thousands of structures in the New England region are affected with crumbling foundations, causing catastrophic losses to homeowners and municipalities. By establishing standards for pyrrhotite content, NIST could mitigate the problem from occurring in other areas, or at least reduce the costs of mitigation.

Right now, any level of pyrrhotite is considered a cancer on a property and makes it unmarketable. This amendment would allocate \$4 million from the NIST general operations funds towards pyrrhotite research, which my office and others have been discussing over

the last year. The amendment would require NIST to research the best testing methods for pyrrhotite detection, as well as to develop a pyrrhotite risk rating scale. This amendment would utilize the world’s leading researchers to mitigate the cost of this problem. In addition, my amendment requests that NIST work with leading academic institutions in this area to expedite this research process—including expediting the procurement process for obtaining concrete samples, should NIST need to utilize core samples containing pyrrhotite to conduct this research.

I urge adoption of this en-bloc package, and I want to thank Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. SERRANO for their kind support for this measure.

HONORING SPECIAL AGENT MICHAEL WILLIAMS ON HIS RETIREMENT

**HON. GARY J. PALMER**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Special Agent Michael Williams for his 32 years of dedicated service to Alabama as a member of the United States Secret Service. He concludes his distinguished career as the Special Agent in Charge of the U.S. Secret Service Birmingham Field Office, where he has had executive oversight over operations in Alabama and Mississippi since 2016.

Special Agent Williams is a native of Birmingham and a graduate of the University of Alabama at Birmingham. He joined the Secret Service in 1985 and over the span of his career has been recognized for investigative excellence, including receiving the Outstanding Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award.

In 1996, he was assigned to the Presidential Protective Division in Washington, D.C. where he protected President William J. Clinton and President George W. Bush. He was promoted to a Supervisory Special Agent assigned to the Protective Intelligence Division in 2001.

Special Agent Williams was able to come home in 2003, when he was promoted to Assistant Special Agent in Charge of the Birmingham Field Office.

He returned to Washington, D.C. in 2005 where he served as the Assistant Special Agent in Charge of the Presidential Protective Division. In October 2008, he was promoted to the Special Agent in Charge of the Columbia, South Carolina Field Office.

In January 2013, he once again found his way to D.C. when he was promoted into the Senior Executive Service where he served as the Special Agent in Charge of the Protective Intelligence and Assessment Division. In this capacity, he had executive oversight for protective intelligence, threat assessments and the Secret Service behavioral analysis program. In 2015, he was promoted to the position of Deputy Assistant Director in the Secret Service Office of Protective Operations. He ensured that the President, the First Lady and all protected persons, places and events received the highest level of security based on threats and vulnerabilities.

Throughout his career, Special Agent Williams has also served the community volunteering for a number of organizations, includ-

ing the Big Brother program, Boys/Girls Club and Crime Stoppers of Metro Alabama. He is a member of Kappa Alpha Phi fraternity and received UAB’s Outstanding Alumni Award. He is married to Angela Bryant-Williams and they have a son, Bryant Michael Williams.

I am grateful to Special Agent Williams for his 32 years of service to this country and wish him well in retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on Monday, June 24, 2019 I unfortunately missed evening votes due to a flight delay. I also missed a vote on June 25th. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 399; YEA on Roll Call No. 400; YEA on Roll Call No. 401; YEA on Roll Call No. 402; and YEA on Roll Call No. 411.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN WEEKS

**HON. BRETT GUTHRIE**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of longtime Kentuckian Mr. John Weeks and to wish him well in his retirement.

For over 40 years, John has provided legal counsel in the commonwealth of Kentucky be it to the Courier Journal daily newspaper, WHAS TV and radio, Standard Gravure, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kentucky, and—since 1992—Delta Dental of Kentucky. In 2000, he became Vice President and General Counsel and in that capacity has been responsible for legal affairs and legal compliance including insurance regulation, HIPAA, employment law, federal requirements, and government relations for the company at both the state and federal level.

Prior to his successful legal career, John served this great county in the United States Navy submarine and intelligence branches. And continued to help other veterans—serving on the board of the Kentucky chapter of USA Cares, a veterans support organization.

I was able to work directly with John from time to time and enjoyed getting to know him and his family well. I’m sure he is looking forward to spending more time with his wife, Lynda, and their children and grandchildren. I would like to formally congratulate John on his retirement and wish him luck in this next chapter.

IN RECOGNITION OF COLONEL DOUGLAS B. GUTTORMSEN

**HON. VICKY HARTZLER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, it has come to my attention that Colonel Douglas B. Guttormsen is retiring as the U.S. Army Corps



of Engineers Kansas City District Commander. He has diligently served in this role for three years.

After earning degrees from The U.S. Military Academy at West Point, the University of Missouri at Rolla, the National Defense University and the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Colonel Guttormsen went on to lead engineering battalions across the United States and around the world. In addition to these assignments, he served in combat operations in Iraq and the Republic of Korea.

As Commander of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Kansas City District, Colonel Guttormsen oversaw many military and civil works projects throughout the District. From overseeing construction projects at the region's many military installations to ensuring our levees and dams are structurally sound, Colonel Guttormsen ably led an office with diverse mandates and responsibilities. Although his resume boasts many accomplishments, Colonel Guttormsen's work to maintain the superiority of the Emergency Operations Center, which plays a vital role in responding to natural disasters whenever and wherever they may occur, is most impressive.

Madam Speaker, Colonel Guttormsen is a true professional and has exhibited remarkable leadership during his time as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Kansas City District Commander. I trust my fellow members of the House will join me in wishing him well in the days to come.

#### KEEP MAIL SAFE ACT

### HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, I rise to bring attention the growing mail theft crime in the United States that is known as mail fishing. Mail fishing is the process in which thieves "fish" mail out of blue collection boxes. Specifically, criminals use a contraption as simple as a string connected to a sticky substance to "fish" out envelopes from these mailboxes, then open the letters to steal people's personal information such as bank, credit card, and Social Security numbers. Tragically, this has resulted in many incidents of identity theft and bank fraud.

In the last year alone, there were 3,000 incidents of mail fishing in New York City. These criminals also engage in check washing to rewrite the name of the payee and/or the amount. Many of my constituents became victims of bank fraud, some losing thousands of dollars, as a result of having their mail fished. That is why, in 2017, I made the push to have the United States Postal Service retrofit all standard mail collection boxes in Queens, NY. Currently, 77 percent of these mailboxes in Queens have been retrofitted. As a result, mail fishing crimes have significantly decreased in Queens. However, as only some mail collection boxes are retrofitted, mail fishing crime shifts to regions without this security feature.

Madam Speaker, it is unacceptable that our constituents cannot safely leave their mail in the United States Postal Service mail collection boxes.

This is why I am introducing the "Keep Mail Safe Act". This bill would require the Post-

master General to conduct a study on retrofitting all standard mail collection boxes in the United States with narrow mail slots. Retrofitting all mail boxes would deter and prevent incidents of mail fishing, ensure the security of our constituents' mail, and restore their trust in utilizing the United States Postal Service.

As mail fishing incidents are on the rise, our diligence in protecting our constituent's mail is more important than ever. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and join me in the fight against mail fishing.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, June 25, 2019, I was unable to be in Washington and missed roll call votes No. 411 "King, Steve (R-IA)—Amendment No. 3—Strikes the section 126 of the underlying bill which prohibits the use of funds from the Department of the Treasury's Forfeiture Fund to plan, design, construct or carry out a project to construct a southern Border Wall or barrier along the southern border of the US," No. 412 "Norton (D-DC) Amendment No. 4—Prohibits funds made available by this Act from being used to relocate the National Institute of Food and Agriculture or the Economic Research Service outside the National Capital Region," No. 413 "Republican Motion to Recommit on H.R. 3401," No. 414 "Passage of H.R. 3401—Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019." Had I been present, I would have voted "YES, NO, YES, NO" on these bills, respectively.

#### NATIONAL LOGISTICS DAY—JUNE 28TH

### HON. MIKE KELLY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge you to designate June 28th as National Logistics Day. For centuries, the logistics industry has connected our world and our nation one shipment at a time. The logistics industry is a prime example of success not only in the United States, but also globally. The field of logistics employs over 50 million people around the world, 5 million of those being proud American citizens.

This year, Logistics Plus, a flourishing company proudly founded and based in Erie, Pennsylvania, requests that June 28th be proclaimed National Logistics Day. Along with being routinely regarded as a thriving contributor in the logistics industry, Logistics Plus, a global logistics company, has generated hundreds of valuable careers in Pennsylvania's 16th district. Since its establishment in 1996, Logistics Plus and its founder, Jim Berlin, have spread award-winning business solutions to their numerous locations worldwide.

The logistics industry is a prominent model of the success, achievement, and prosperity that American businesses and corporations

strive for daily. Often, the current administration speaks on the importance of business and commercial activity in the United States and global community. Logistics Plus and the Logistics industry overall is an outstanding representation of the continuous economic growth, with approximately eight percent of products made and sold in the U.S. being attributed to logistics. The third-party logistics industry (3PL), which aids in business management of supply chains, represents an \$800 billion industry on its own. The national logistics industry connects and unites the country by aiding in the transportation of more than 13 billion tons of freight domestically by means of roads, sea, air, and rail.

It is vital that we recognize the dedicated professionals in the logistics industry who unify and strengthen our world community through safe, reliable, and affordable transportation and storage services. National Logistics Day on June 28th serves as an annual show of appreciation and recognition to the industry, which has contributed to our national and global economies. I urge this committee to ensure that this sign of commendation to an industry that has demonstrated the value of hard work time and again be granted the national acknowledgement of achievement by declaring June 28th National Logistics Day.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, June 18, 2019 I inadvertently switched my recorded vote for Roll call No. 345. The vote was on Amendment No. 24 to H.R. 2740 offered by Reps. AMASH and LOFGREN. My intended vote should be noted as a "yea" on roll call 345.

#### HONORING PRIDE MONTH

### HON. SYLVIA R. GARCIA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to discuss an issue that is rooted in my deeply held religious belief that we are all God's children.

This June, in honor of Pride month, I rise not only to recognize the many contributions of the LGBTQ community, but also to remind my colleagues of the discrimination faced by Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer people.

House Democrats worked together last month to make history by passing the Equality Act and passed the Defense Appropriations bill with a provision to block this Administration's attempts to discriminate against the transgender community and will continue the fight until there is true equality. I know this House will continue to fight and stand up for equality.

This Pride Month, I also want to pay special tribute to LGBTQ people living in fear of deportation.

This Administration's policies of fear and cruelty especially impact already vulnerable

populations. Rest assured, you have someone in Congress working to make our immigration system fair for all, including LGBTQ New Americans.

Happy Pride Month.

GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS  
MONTH

**HON. JOYCE BEATTY**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize June as Gun Violence Awareness Month.

So far this year, nearly seven thousand Americans have been killed and almost twice as many injured at the hands of gun violence.

Even more shocking, there have been 190 mass shootings across the country—in Shreveport, Philadelphia, Louisville, and Des Moines just within the last week.

Gun violence is a uniquely American epidemic, but unfortunately, failure to act has also been uniquely American.

Congress failed to act twenty years ago after Columbine, again twelve years ago after Virginia Tech, or after Sandy Hook, the Pulse Nightclub, Las Vegas, or Parkland.

Thankfully, the new Democratic majority has passed the first gun violence prevention bills in a generation.

Whether it's those bills or my SAFER Now Act (H.R. 282), Congress must continue our work "For the People" and act to prevent one more American from falling victim to gun violence.

HONORING AMERICA'S DAIRY  
FARMERS DURING NATIONAL  
DAIRY MONTH

**HON. JAMES R. BAIRD**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize our nation's dairy farmers. Since 1937, the month of June has been set aside to celebrate National Dairy Month.

The dairy industry, and the products it produces, is extremely important to the agricultural sector and hundreds of millions of Americans and consumers around the world. It generates \$38 billion of direct wages for 3 million jobs on 37,000 family-owned dairy farms and related industries.

But times have been tough in recent years with narrow margins and low to no profitability. In fact, this is the fifth consecutive year that we've had low prices, pushing 2,700 dairy farmers out of business in 2018.

That's why USDA's Dairy Margin Coverage Program is so important to the American dairy industry. The Dairy Margin Coverage program will provide farmers with better coverage for lower premiums, including a retro-active start which means our dairy farmers will be able to get help with over 5 months of tough losses.

As we honor the dairy producers in our communities this month, I encourage all of our Hoosier dairy farmers to sign up for their program in order to secure much needed protec-

tion during times of uncertainty. I thank them for their tireless work for the American people.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT  
SUCCESS ACT

**HON. GRACE MENG**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, community colleges play a critical role in American higher education. There are over 1,000 community colleges across the United States. Nearly 40 percent of undergraduates are enrolled in community colleges. Of these students a large portion are first-generation, low-income college students, and half are students of color. Community colleges indeed play a crucial role in closing our nation's skills gap through education and workforce training. Unfortunately, many of these institutions are often under-resourced. This leaves students without the necessary support to complete their degrees.

Access to college means little without degree completion. Studies show that only 20 percent of full-time community college students graduate after three years and just 35 percent graduate after five years. Research is also clear that students who do not complete a degree are at greater risk of defaulting on their loans.

That is why, today, I am introducing the Community College Student Success Act of 2019, a bill that will help community colleges around the country by giving under-resourced colleges with high percentages of low-income and minority students the necessary funding to develop and implement comprehensive student support services.

First, the Community College Student Success Act would provide academic advising, wherein, advisors will provide ongoing, academic, and personal advising to students including helping to clearly lay out a three-year graduation plan and creating strong transfer pathways for students interested in continuing their education.

Second, this bill would provide academic and career support, wherein, students on academic probation or who have been referred to developmental courses will be required to meet weekly with a tutor. These students will also meet with an on-campus career counselor or participate in career services events at least once a semester to promote career planning and success.

Third, this bill would provide financial support, wherein, students will receive a tuition waiver to cover the gap between the tuition and fees and financial aid. Additionally, students satisfying all the meeting requirements will receive a financial incentive, such as a transportation pass or gas card, at least once per month.

Additionally, the goal of this legislation is to replicate the remarkable and proven success of the Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP)—a program that was created and instituted by the City University of New York (CUNY) in 2007. This program has been found to consistently double the graduation rates of participating students.

Madam Speaker, the Community College Student Success Act of 2019 ultimately seeks to help achieve student success through holistic and student-centered services.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and join me in helping community college students across the nation by providing pathways to upward economic mobility and more opportunities. If Congress truly values the importance of educating our next generation, we must increase our investment in these institutions and the students they serve. Each person deserves a quality education—no matter their background—because education is a civil right.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. MAC THORNBERRY**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, June 25, 2019, I was unable to be in Washington and missed roll call votes No. 407 "Republican Motion to Recommit on H.R. 3055," No. 408 "Passage of H.R. 3055—Commerce, Justice, Science, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, Interior, Environment, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2020," No. 409 "Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 462—The rule providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 3401—Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019," No. 410 "Adoption of H. Res. 462—The rule providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 3401—Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019." Had I been present, I would have voted "YES, NO, NO, NO" on these bills, respectively.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF MICHAEL  
ERIC ENGH, S.J.

**HON. ANNA G. ESHOO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 27, 2019*

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Michael Eric Engh, S.J., on the occasion of his retirement as President of Santa Clara University, after a decade of extraordinary leadership.

Father Engh was born to Marie and Donald Engh in Los Angeles on December 14, 1949. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1972, and earned his M.A. at Gonzaga University in 1976. He earned his Master of Divinity degree from the Jesuit School of Theology, in Berkeley, California in 1982 and his Ph.D. at the University of Wisconsin in 1987.

Father Engh taught at Loyola Marymount University from 1988 to 2008, became Santa Clara University's 28th President on January 5, 2009, and retires from the Presidency after a most distinguished decade on June 30, 2019.

Father Engh serves on a number of boards, including the Board of Trustees of Boston College; the Board of Directors of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group; the Board of Directors of the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities; the Council of Presidents of the

Graduate Theological Union; and the Board of Trustees of Bellarmine College Preparatory.

Since arriving at Santa Clara, Father Engh has led the University in defining its vision and setting the course for the future with a bold plan, Santa Clara 2020. Under his decade of leadership the University's endowment grew to \$926 million in 2019, from \$515 million in 2009. The University also recorded significant student accomplishments and accolades including Rhodes and Fulbright Scholars.

Ten new undergraduate majors were instituted, several Masters programs were launched, and the REAL program for summer research in the College of Arts & Sciences began, among many others, and the Law

School's Intellectual Property Program was ranked fourth by US News in 2019. During Father Engh's tenure the campus was beautified and improved, and many new buildings were opened and facilities modernized, with many more in the process of development.

The era of Father Engh bears the imprimatur of diversity and inclusion. He established the Office for Diversity and Inclusion in 2013 and created the Blue Ribbon Commission on Diversity and Inclusion in 2016, increasing significantly the number of students of color from 45 percent to 51 percent.

Sustainability has been a hallmark of the Engh presidency. He signed the Climate Neutrality Action Plan and established the Office

of Sustainability which grew into the Center for Sustainability with additional staff and programming. His efforts resulted in a deep-seated culture of sustainability across the entire University and ingrained in the community the importance of justice and sustainability.

Madam Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring Father Michael Engh for his superb leadership of Santa Clara University which is not only a jewel in the crown of Jesuit universities but also one of the finest institutions of higher learning in the United States. His remarkable decade as President has strengthened our region, our state of California and he is a great blessing to our nation.

# Daily Digest

## HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed S. 1790, National Defense Authorization Act, as amended.

## Senate

### Chamber Action

*Routine Proceedings, pages S4587–S4667*

**Measures Introduced:** Forty-nine bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1999–2047, S. Res. 267–271, and S. Con. Res. 21. **Pages S4627–29**

#### Measures Reported:

S. 580, to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the “Former Presidents Act of 1958”, with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–53)

**Page S4627**

#### Measures Passed:

**National Defense Authorization Act:** By 86 yeas to 8 nays (Vote No. 188), Senate passed S. 1790, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, by the order of the Senate of Wednesday, June 26, 2019, 60 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and after taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto: **Pages S4589–S4604**

Adopted:

By 90 yeas to 4 nays (Vote No. 187), McConnell (for Romney) Amendment No. 861 (to Amendment No. 764), to provide that funds authorized by the Act are available for the defense of the Armed Forces and United States citizens against attack by foreign hostile forces. **Pages S4599–S4600**

McConnell (for Inhofe) Modified Amendment No. 764, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S4604**

Withdrawn:

McConnell Amendment No. 864 (to Amendment No. 863), of a perfecting nature. **Page S4599**

McConnell Amendment No. 863 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 764), to change the enactment date. **Page S4599**

McConnell Amendment No. 862 (to Amendment No. 861), to change the enactment date. **Page S4599**

Pending:

Udall Amendment No. 883, to prohibit unauthorized military operations in or against Iran. **Pages S4619–21**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 87 yeas to 7 nays (Vote No. 186), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on McConnell (for Inhofe) Modified Amendment No. 764 (listed above). **Page S4599**

McConnell motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 865, to change the enactment date, fell when cloture was invoked on McConnell (for Inhofe) Modified Amendment No. 764. **Page S4600**

McConnell Amendment No. 866 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 865), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 865 (listed above) fell. **Page S4600**

McConnell Amendment No. 867 (to Amendment No. 866), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell Amendment No. 866 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 865) fell. **Page S4600**

Pursuant to the order of Wednesday, June 26, 2019, the motion to invoke cloture on the bill was withdrawn. **Page S4604**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of Udall Amendment No. 883 (listed above), to the bill, as amended, at approximately 5:00 a.m., on Friday, June 28, 2019, under the order of Wednesday, June 26, 2019. **Page S4665**

**TANF block grants:** Senate passed H.R. 2940, to extend the program of block grants to States for

temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through September 30, 2019. **Page S4648**

**Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program:** Senate passed S. 2047, to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program. **Pages S4648–49**

**Stonewall uprising 50th Anniversary:** Senate agreed to S. Res. 270, recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Stonewall uprising. **Page S4649**

**Collector Car Appreciation Day:** Senate agreed to S. Res. 271, designating July 12, 2019, as “Collector Car Appreciation Day” and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States. **Page S4649**

**Columbia River In-Lieu and Treaty Fishing Access Sites Improvement Act:** Senate passed S. 50, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S4649**

McConnell (for Hoeven) Amendment No. 904, to amend the authorization amount. **Page S4649**

**Indian Community Economic Enhancement Act:** Senate passed S. 212, to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S4649–52**

McConnell (for Hoeven) Amendment No. 905, to improve the Indian Economic Development Feasibility Study. **Page S4650**

**Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon:** Senate passed S. 832, to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865. **Page S4652**

**Tanana Tribal Council and Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation:** Senate passed S. 224, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska, and to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska. **Pages S4652–53**

**PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act:** Senate passed S. 209, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes. **Pages S4652, S4653–60**

**Esther Martinez Native American Languages Programs Reauthorization Act:** Senate passed S. 256, to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages. **Pages S4652, S4660**

**Native American Business Incubators Program Act:** Senate passed S. 294, to establish a business incubators program within the Department of the Interior to promote economic development in Indian reservation communities. **Pages S4652, S4660–62**

**Tribal HUD–VASH Act:** Senate passed S. 257, to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans. **Pages S4652, S4662–63**

**Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation Equitable Compensation Act:** Senate passed S. 216, to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam. **Pages S4652, S4663–64**

**Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Repeal Act:** Senate passed S. 46, to repeal the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act. **Pages S4652, S4664**

**Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe Reservation Restoration Act:** Senate passed S. 199, to provide for the transfer of certain Federal land in the State of Minnesota for the benefit of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe. **Pages S4652, S4664**

**National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month and National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day:** Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 220, designating the month of June 2019 as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month” and June 27, 2019, as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day”, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S4665**

**Signing Authority—Agreement:** A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Majority Leader, and Senators Graham, Lankford, and Tillis be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions from June 27, 2019 through July 8, 2019. **Page S4645**

**Authorizing Leadership To Make Appointments—Agreement:** A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that, notwithstanding

the upcoming adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the Majority and Minority Leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate. **Page S4648**

**Pro Forma Sessions—Agreement:** A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Tuesday, July 2, 2019, at 4:45 p.m.; Friday, July 5, 2019, at 11:45 a.m.; and that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, July 5, 2019, it next convene at 3 p.m., on Monday, July 8, 2019. **Page S4665**

**Bress Nomination—Cloture:** Senate began consideration of the nomination of Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Page S4643**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, June 27, 2019, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, July 8, 2019. **Page S4643**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S4643**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S4643**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the nomination at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, July 8, 2019. **Page S4665**

**Wetherell II Nomination—Cloture:** Senate began consideration of the nomination of T. Kent Wetherell II, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida. **Pages S4643–44**

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 Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Page S4644**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S4643**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S4643**

**Leichty Nomination—Cloture:** Senate began consideration of the nomination of Damon Ray Leichty, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana. **Page S4644**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of T. Kent Wetherell II, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida. **Page S4644**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S4644**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S4644**

**Ranjan Nomination—Cloture:** Senate began consideration of the nomination of J. Nicholas Ranjan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania. **Page S4644**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Damon Ray Leichty, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana. **Page S4644**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S4644**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S4644**

**King Nomination—Cloture:** Senate began consideration of the nomination of Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education. **Page S4644**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of J. Nicholas Ranjan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania. **Page S4644**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S4644**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S4644**

**Pallasch Nomination—Cloture:** Senate began consideration of the nomination of John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Page S4644

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

Page S4644

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

Page S4644

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Page S4644

**Wright Nomination—Cloture:** Senate began consideration of the nomination of Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency.

Pages S4644–45

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Page S4645

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

Page S4644

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Page S4644

**Nominations—Agreement:** A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during the session of Thursday, June 27, 2019 ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, July 8, 2019.

Page S4665

**Nominations Confirmed:** Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Christopher Scolese, of New York, to be Director of the National Reconnaissance Office.

Page S4642

Gary B. Burman, of Kentucky, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of four years.

William D. Hyslop, of Washington, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Washington for the term of four years.

Randall P. Huff, of Wyoming, to be United States Marshal for the District of Wyoming for the term of four years.

Page S4642

Veronica Daigle, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Page S4642

Robert Wallace, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife.

Page S4642

Aimee Kathryn Jorjani, of Wisconsin, to be Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for a term expiring January 19, 2021.

Pages S4642–43

Lane Genatowski, of New York, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, Department of Energy.

Page S4643

Ronald Douglas Johnson, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of El Salvador.

David Michael Satterfield, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey.

Page S4643

Aditya Bamzai, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for the remainder of the term expiring January 29, 2020.

Travis LeBlanc, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2022.

Edward W. Felten, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2025.

Page S4643

2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

29 Army nominations in the rank of general.

23 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy.

Pages S4639–42

**Messages from the House:** Page S4625

**Measures Referred:** Page S4625

**Executive Communications:** Pages S4625–26

**Petitions and Memorials:** Pages S4626–27

**Executive Reports of Committees:** Page S4627

**Additional Cosponsors:** Pages S4629–31

**Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:** Pages S4631–35

**Additional Statements:** Pages S4624–25

**Amendments Submitted:** Pages S4638–39

**Authorities for Committees to Meet:** Page S4639

**Privileges of the Floor:** Page S4639

**Record Votes:** Three record votes were taken today. (Total—188) Pages S4599–S4600, S4604

**Recess:** Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and recessed at 7:10 p.m., until 5 a.m. on Friday, June 28, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4665.)

## Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, after receiving testimony from Kimberly Reed, President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States.

### NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine options for the interim and long-term storage of nuclear waste, including S. 1234, to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste, after receiving testimony from John Wagner, Associate Laboratory Director, Nuclear Science and Technology Directorate, Idaho National Laboratory, Department of Energy; Geoffrey H. Fettus, Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., and Maria Korsnick, Nuclear Energy Institute, both of Washington, D.C.; Steven P. Nesbit, American Nuclear Society Nuclear Waste Policy Task Force, Charlotte, North Carolina; and Wayne Norton, Yankee Atomic Electric Company, East Hampton, Connecticut, on behalf of the Decommissioning Plant Coalition Steering Committee.

### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Daniel Habib Jorjani, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor, and Mark Lee Greenblatt, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, both of the Department of the Interior.

### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1227, to require the Federal Trade Commission to study the role of intermediaries in the pharmaceutical supply chain and provide Congress with appropriate policy recommendations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 440, to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide that a patent owner may not assert sovereign immunity as a defense in certain actions before the United States Patent and Trademark Office, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1224, to enable the Federal Trade Commission to deter filing of sham citizen petitions to cover an attempt to interfere with approval of a competing generic drug or biosimilar, to foster competition, and facilitate the efficient review of petitions filed in good faith to raise legitimate public health concerns, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1416, to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit anticompetitive behaviors by drug product manufacturers, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Peter Joseph Phipps, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Charles R. Eskridge III, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, William Shaw Stickman IV, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Jennifer Philpott Wilson, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and Wilmer Ocasio, to be United States Marshal for the District of Puerto Rico, Department of Justice.

### INTELLIGENCE

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

---

# House of Representatives

## Chamber Action

**Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:** 69 public bills, H.R. 3524–3592; and 7 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 50; and H. Res. 467–472 were introduced. **Pages H5255–58**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages H5260–61**

**Reports Filed:** Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 466, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–130);

H.R. 3153, to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support research on opioid addiction, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–131);



H.R. 3196, to designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the “Vera Rubin Survey Telescope” (H. Rept. 116–132); Supplemental report on H.R. 2500, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–120, Part 2);

H.R. 1146, to amend Public Law 115–97 (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act) to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge oil and gas program, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–133);

H.R. 255, to provide for an exchange of lands with San Bernardino County, California, to enhance management of lands within the San Bernardino National Forest, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–134); and

H.R. 434, to designate the Emancipation National Historic Trail, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 116–135). **Page H5255**

**Speaker:** Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Escobar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5205**

**Journal:** The House agreed to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 159 yeas to 149 nays with one answering “present”, Roll No. 430. **Pages H5205, H5250**

**Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019—Rule for Consideration:** The House began consideration of H. Res. 466, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. Subsequently, the resolution was withdrawn. **Pages H5223–41**

A point of order was raised against the consideration of H. Res. 466 and it was agreed to proceed with consideration of the resolution by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 425. **Pages H5223–26**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 1:22 p.m. and reconvened at 3:30 p.m. **Page H5241**

**Securing America’s Federal Elections Act:** The House passed H.R. 2722, to protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure used to carry out such elections, by a recorded vote of 225 yeas to 184 noes, Roll No. 428. **Pages H5207–23, H5243–46**

Rejected the motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on House Administration with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith

with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 189 yeas to 220 noes, Roll No. 427. **Pages H5243–45**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–20, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–126, shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill. **Page H5207**

H. Res. 460, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2722) and (H.R. 3351) was agreed to Tuesday, June 25th.

**Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019:** The House concurred in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3401, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, by a recorded vote of 305 yeas to 102 noes, Roll No. 429. **Pages H5241–43, H5246–50**

H. Res. 466, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3401), as amended by Representative McGovern, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 322 yeas to 85 nays, Roll No. 426, after the previous question was ordered on the amendment and the resolution without objection. **Pages H5242–43**

**Permission to File Report:** Agreed by unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to file a supplemental report on H.R. 2500, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year. **Page H5251**

**Meeting Hour:** Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3:30 p.m. tomorrow, June 28th. **Page H5251**

**Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group—Appointment:** The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group: Representatives Duffy, Hurd (TX), Cloud, and Spano. **Page H5252**

**Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy—Appointment:** The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy: Representative Rutherford. **Page H5252**

**Senate Referral:** S. 528 was held at the desk. **Page H5241**

**Senate Message:** Message received from the Senate today appears on page H5241.

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** Three yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5225–26, H5242–43, H5244–45, H5245–46, H5249–50, and H5250. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

## Committee Meetings

### DOCUMENT PRODUCTION STATUS

#### UPDATE: OPM, FBI, AND GSA

*Committee on Oversight and Reform:* Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled “Document Production Status Update: OPM, FBI, and GSA”. Testimony was heard from Robert Borden, Chief of Staff, General Services Administration; Stephen M. Billy, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of Personnel Management; and Jill Tyson, Assistant Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

### SENATE AMENDMENT TO THE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SECURITY AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER ACT, 2019

*Committee on Rules:* Full Committee held a hearing on the Senate amendment to H.R. 3401, the “Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019”. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a rule providing for consideration of the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3401, the “Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019”. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–21. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion and the Senate amendment. The rule provides that the Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The rule provides one hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

### MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:* Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3494, the “Damon

Paul Nelson and Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018, 2019, and 2020”; and to authorize all Members of the House of Representatives to review, at a time to be determined by the Committee, the Classified Annex to H.R. 3494, the “Damon Paul Nelson and Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018, 2019, and 2020”. H.R. 3494 was ordered reported, as amended. Adoption of the Classified Annex to Accompany H.R. 3494; and Authorization for Members to Review, for a Period of Three days in Advance of Floor consideration in the House of H.R. 3494, as amended, passed. This meeting was closed.

## Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

---

### NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D675)

S. 1379, to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response. Signed on June 24, 2019. (Public Law 116–22)

H.R. 299, to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam. Signed on June 25, 2019. (Public Law 116–23)

H.R. 559, to amend section 6 of the Joint Resolution entitled “A Joint Resolution to approve the Covenant To Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America”. Signed on June 25, 2019. (Public Law 116–24)

---

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

#### Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

#### House

No hearings are scheduled.

*Next Meeting of the SENATE*

5 a.m., Friday, June 28

*Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*

3:30 p.m., Friday, June 28

## Senate Chamber

**Program for Friday:** Senate will continue consideration of Udall Amendment No. 883, and vote on adoption of the amendment, notwithstanding the passage of S. 1790, National Defense Authorization Act, as amended.

## House Chamber

**Program for Friday:** House will meet in Pro Forma session at 3:30 p.m.

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

## HOUSE

Baird, James R., Ind., E862  
 Beatty, Joyce, Ohio, E859, E862  
 Bergman, Jack, Mich., E856, E858  
 Buck, Ken, Colo., E857  
 Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E855  
 Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E858  
 Cook, Paul, Calif., E857  
 Courtney, Joe, Conn., E860  
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E862  
 Gallagher, Mike, Wisc., E859  
 Garcia, Sylvia R., Tex., E861

Gianforte, Greg, Mont., E855  
 Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E861  
 Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E858, E860  
 Hartzler, Vicky, Mo., E860  
 Hern, Kevin, Okla., E856  
 Jordan, Jim, Ohio, E858  
 Keating, William R., Mass., E855  
 Kelly, Mike, Pa., E861  
 McAdams, Ben, Utah, E859  
 McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E860  
 Meng, Grace, N.Y., E861, E862  
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E859

Palmer, Gary J., Ala., E860  
 Plaskett, Stacey E., Virgin Islands, E856  
 Reed, Tom, N.Y., E857  
 Rose, John W., Tenn., E857  
 Sherrill, Mikie, N.J., E855  
 Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E858  
 Thompson, Mike, Calif., E856  
 Thornberry, Mac, Tex., E857, E861, E862  
 Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E856, E858  
 Waltz, Michael, Fla., E855  
 Wexton, Jennifer, Va., E859



# 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](http://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](mailto:contactcenter@gpo.gov). ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://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.