



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 2018

No. 108

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 27, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HAROLD ROGERS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

MOURNING THE LOSS OF MAJOR GENERAL GEORGE W. KEEFE

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to mourn the loss of a great American patriot, Major General George W. Keefe, former adjutant general of the Massachusetts National Guard who passed away last week at the age of 79.

A lifelong resident of Northampton, Massachusetts, which I had the honor

of representing for 20 years, General Keefe dedicated his life in service to our country, his community, and protecting the freedoms we all hold so dear.

He was called an airman's airman and wore the uniform with great honor and, indeed, distinction.

I knew General Keefe well and got to see firsthand what an exemplary leader and decent person he was. Beyond his military accomplishments and commendations, he was a loving husband, a dedicated father and grandfather, and, indeed, to many of us, a very good friend.

General Keefe enlisted with the 104th Fighter Wing at Barnes Air National Guard Base as an airman in 1956 at the age of 17. He continued to work his way up the ranks, becoming an officer and eventually serving as the wing's vice commander.

In 1999, General Keefe was asked to serve as adjutant general of the Massachusetts National Guard, the first Air Force officer and western Massachusetts resident to hold that post in more than 200 years of history. He retired in 2005, ending what is deemed a remarkable military career.

The motto in the Air Force is: "Aim High. Fly-Fight-Win." George Keefe did that for nearly a half century. On behalf of the United States of America, I want to thank him for his distinguished service to our Nation.

My thoughts and prayers today are with his sons, Gary, Jim, Patrick, Tim, and their families. May he rest in peace.

CONGRATULATING BISCAYNE ENGINEERING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to congratulate Biscayne

Engineering as it celebrates its 120th anniversary this year.

Located in my congressional district, Biscayne Engineering is one of the oldest, if not the oldest, business in the city of Miami, and the oldest land-surveying firm in south Florida.

Over 100 years ago, two partners, J.S. Frederick and W.E. Brown, established the company just 2 years after the city was incorporated in 1898 and made the first official map of the city of Miami just a few years later.

They were tasked with many important projects that were vital to the community, including laying out the city of Miami's streets and other parts of the greater county. One of its most prominent projects was their role in developing Villa Vizcaya, a north Italian, 16th century-style villa built for James Deering.

Biscayne Engineering's responsibility included building and road design, paving and drainage layouts, and the conservation and preservation of the estate's national foliage. Today, Vizcaya Museum and Gardens serves as a national historic landmark for visitors from all over the world to come and enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, for decades, Biscayne Engineering has had its hands on so many important projects that have helped shape south Florida into the jewel that it is today. It has aided in the development of our U.S. post office building; Federal courthouse; Bayside Marketplace; Fisher Island; Star Island, which is the area's first manmade island; and even assisted with the renovation of many of the historic art deco hotels in Miami Beach, which is located in my congressional district.

Additionally, Biscayne Engineering has been involved with the Miami-Dade Transit Metromover, the Miami-Dade Public Library System, and the Adrienne Arsht Center for the Performing Arts.

Biscayne Engineering has professionally partnered and worked with

□ 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.

H5751

private clients, local municipalities, counties, and State government, and even played a larger role in the surveying and construction of two of my alma maters, the University of Miami—go Canes—and Florida International University—go Panthers. The list goes on and on.

Most importantly, its engineering surveyors, planners, and staff uniformly promote the company's core values of integrity, honor, and leadership in their work and, to this day, still continue the commitment and the tradition of its founders.

So congratulations to Biscayne Engineering on its 120th anniversary. I am always glad to celebrate anything that is older than I.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MAJOR GENERAL GEORGE W. KEEFE

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a proud servant of the people and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Major General George W. Keefe, who passed away last Thursday, June 21.

He will be laid to rest tomorrow, June 28, in Northampton, Massachusetts, surrounded by his family, friends, fellow officers, and the men and women who served with him throughout his 49-year career in military service.

Major General George W. Keefe was born in 1939 in Northampton. He attended public schools in Northampton and graduated from Northampton High School in 1956. He received his associate's degree from Holyoke Community College in 1966.

He enlisted in the Massachusetts Air National Guard's 104th Tactical Fighter Group in 1956 as a crash fire rescue specialist, attaining the rank of master sergeant before he was selected for a commission as an officer and first lieutenant.

He served as a squadron group and vice wing commander at the 104th Tactical Fighter Group before being selected to serve at the Massachusetts National Guard Joint Force Headquarters. He was the last member to serve in uniform of the Massachusetts Air National Guard that was federally activated and deployed from October 1961 to September 1962 in Phalsbourg, France, for Operation Stair Step, the U.S. military's response to the Berlin crisis.

George was also enshrined in the U.S. Air Force's Enlisted Heritage Hall at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama as one of the few general officers who rose from the rank of airman basic to major general.

He was selected and appointed as the 39th adjutant general of Massachusetts in 1999 by Governor Paul Cellucci. With this appointment, he became the first U.S. Air Force officer to serve as a

Massachusetts adjutant general since 1778. That is a long time, even by Massachusetts reckoning.

He continued to serve under Lieutenant Governor and then acting Governor Jane Swift, and Governor Mitt Romney reappointed George to a second term as adjutant general, a position he held until retiring in 2005 after 49 years of military service.

Among one of the bigger moments in his job as adjutant general was September 11, 2001, when he had to activate the Massachusetts National Guard to respond to the terror attacks on New York City that involved two jetliners that had flown out of Logan International Airport in Boston.

I first met Major General Keefe at the start of my second term in office. I had just won my first reelection campaign and he had just been appointed adjutant general of Massachusetts National Guard. I respected the experience and long view that he brought to his position, and he was very helpful to me then and over the next 6 years in understanding the priorities of the Massachusetts National Guard and introducing me to the soldiers, airmen, and uniformed men and women who serve in the Massachusetts Guard and Reserve as well as their families.

I appreciated his Irish sense of humor, and I admired and respected his dedication and service to our country, the Commonwealth, and, most importantly, to the many servicemembers of the Massachusetts National Guard.

Like so many in Massachusetts, his little piece of heaven was his house on Cape Cod where he watched his sons and his grandchildren enjoy the beach, the waves, fried seafood, and the countless whiffle ball and miniature golf matches.

The eldest of his four sons, Gary W. Keefe, currently serves as adjutant general of the Massachusetts Air National Guard.

Few lives are as filled with service, love of friends and family, and so firmly rooted in Massachusetts as that of former Major General George W. Keefe. He made a big difference in the lives of so many people and in the life and history of our Nation.

Major General George W. Keefe was not only a great man but, more importantly, a very, very good man. He will be missed, and we salute him as we say farewell and Godspeed.

PROTECT AMERICA'S BAKERS

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand up for New Jersey jobs and New Jersey workers who are the best in the world. In Fair Lawn, New Jersey, the men and women at Mondelez bake top-quality products like Oreos, Teddy Grahams, Ritz Crackers, Chips Ahoy, and Barnum's Animal Crackers.

Mr. Speaker, Americans who enjoy Oreos or animal crackers would be proud to know that these delicious cookies and crackers are produced right here in America. However, I believe they would be shocked to hear about some of the recent practices of the company that threaten these employees' retirement and will outsource their U.S. production jobs to Mexico, an issue that Democrats and Republicans alike are rightly sounding the alarm about.

In the past month, Mondelez announced its intention to withdraw from its employees' retirement plan that the company participated in for 60 years, setting the stage for a retirement catastrophe that could impact more than 100,000 American workers.

The men and women I represent have worked hard and played by the rules their whole lives, responsibly planning for their retirements, taking care of their families, doing what they need to do. Mondelez can't just change the rules mid-game as people prepare for their retirements.

Mr. Speaker, America's seniors deserve security when they retire, and our workers deserve nothing but the best. Destroying retirement income, shipping jobs overseas to low-wage countries, and eroding the middle class sets us on a dangerous and unsustainable path.

I stand with the Bakery, Confectionary, Tobacco Workers & Grain Millers Local 719 in Fair Lawn and America's jobs. And I hope that Mondelez can sit down at the table and find a way to keep their commitments to New Jersey workers while continuing to make a great product in the United States of America and in New Jersey in the district that I represent.

HONORING THE CAREER OF ARMY CORPS COLONEL JOHN P. LLOYD

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Colonel John P. Lloyd, commander of the Pittsburgh District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Colonel Lloyd assumed command of the Pittsburgh District on July 29, 2016. As the commander, he is responsible for carrying out the district's mission within the Ohio River basin, which includes more than 328 miles of navigable waterways on the Allegheny River, Monongahela River, and upper Ohio River.

The Pittsburgh District's 26,000 square miles include portions of western Pennsylvania, northeastern West Virginia, eastern Ohio, western Maryland, and southwestern New York. Colonel Lloyd oversees 23 navigation locks and dams, 16 multipurpose flood damage reduction reservoirs, 80 local flood damage reduction projects, and other projects to protect and enhance water resources.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of getting to know Colonel Lloyd during his tenure as commander of the Pittsburgh District, and he is a true public servant. He oversaw the Task Force Power Restoration effort in Puerto Rico after Hurricanes Irma and Maria tore through in 2017. He mobilized and deployed a specialized team of Army Corps personnel to rebuild the island's electrical system of power generation, transmission, and distribution.

Colonel Lloyd's team worked with FEMA, the Department of Energy, the power industry, Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority, and other stakeholders to restore more than 85 percent of Puerto Rico's prestorm power grid within 5 months. He displayed truly remarkable leadership.

Colonel Lloyd also took the time to travel to my district to meet with the Punxsutawney Borough Council to discuss modifications for its levees.

His expertise is second to none, and we have been fortunate enough to have Colonel Lloyd at the helm in the Pittsburgh District.

Prior to his assignment in Pittsburgh, Colonel Lloyd served in a variety of engineer command and leadership positions, including battalion commander of the 19th Engineer Battalion at Fort Knox, Kentucky. Before that, he served as the Army fellow assigned to the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies in Honolulu, Hawaii.

□ 1015

Colonel Lloyd is a man with numerous military awards and decorations, and the accolades surely do match his commitment and dedication to his job.

I wish Colonel Lloyd the best as he departs the Pittsburgh District for his next assignment. He has done an outstanding job for the citizens of northwestern Pennsylvania, and it has been an honor and a privilege to get to know this fine individual over the past 2 years.

NATIONAL ORCA PROTECTION MONTH

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

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago we reached another troublesome milestone for Puget Sound's magnificent, but endangered, orca population.

We lost yet another southern resident orca, this time a 23-year-old male known as L-92. This is the third death just in the past year, and the sixth in the past 2 years.

There are now just 75 southern resident orcas left, the lowest number in 34 years. In fact, that is 13 fewer whales than when the population was initially listed in 2005 under the Endangered Species Act.

I am sad about this loss and frustrated about this loss. Indeed, I am beyond frustrated. I am beyond frustrated because we know what needs to be done to save this iconic species in

the Pacific Northwest. But, quite frankly, the Federal Government isn't living up to its partnership responsibility.

Back home in Washington State, the State government and local partners are stepping up. Governor Inslee earlier this year created the Southern Resident Orca Task Force, and he charged two terrific public servants, my friends, Stephanie Solien and Les Purce, with leading it. But these partners can't do it alone; nor should they.

We all have to fully invest in the Puget Sound in orca recovery programs. Mr. Speaker, I remind you Puget Sound is the largest estuary in the United States of America.

The good news is we know where our efforts need to go. Eighty percent of the southern resident orcas' diet is Chinook salmon, and these salmon populations are in just as much danger of extinction as our orcas. Most of those salmon are gone. They are being eaten by sea lions and seals; and where they swim in Puget Sound it is simply too polluted.

The pollution killing them is from storm water runoff—toxic metals, chemicals, and oils. It kills literally in a matter of hours, and we have the film to prove it. Storm water runoff remains the largest source of pollution in Puget Sound, and we cannot save our beloved orcas and our salmon if we do not stop that. Period.

So we will fight for funding to tackle these problems. But I also believe we have to raise awareness. That is why last week I introduced H. Res. 959, which would designate June 2018 as National Orca Protection Month. In Washington State, we gather every June to celebrate our southern resident orcas. We join Native American Tribes who have always recognized and honored the spiritual and cultural significance of that which they call the Blackfish.

But as the orca population has declined, these celebrations have turned into calls for action. National Orca Protection Month serves as a reminder of work that requires a year-round focus. It is vital that the Federal Government play its vital partnership role.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to please support this resolution to designate National Orca Protection Month. Let's give our Federal agencies the resources they need to prevent the extinction of this beautiful and magnificent species and ensure that orcas survive for generations yet to come.

PREVENTING INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the heartbreaking story of an Orange County father named Randy Collins. On March 3, 2003, Randy and his wife

welcomed their son, Keisuke, to the world.

Following their divorce, Randy became concerned that his ex-wife would flee with their son to her home country, Japan. The California court system agreed and granted a temporary restraining order on foreign travel for their son. Unfortunately, this did not prevent the abduction from taking place.

I first met Randy during my time in the California State Senate when we worked together on legislation to prevent future international parental child abductions. I am proud the bill, named Keisuke's Law in honor of Randy's son, passed the State legislature unanimously and was signed into law on September 7, 2012.

This month marks 12 years since Randy, a loving and devoted father, last saw his son. Japan continues to have one of the worst records in returning abducted children like Keisuke to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as the mother of four, I can only imagine the pain that Randy must feel missing each passing milestone of his son's life. This is a grave injustice, and I will continue to support Randy and all families whose children have been wrongfully abducted.

REMEMBERING DUNCAN GIGERICH

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Duncan Gigerich whose life was tragically cut short on June 9, 2018.

Duncan was only 19 years old at the time he passed away, yet he demonstrated maturity well beyond his years. As a high school football player, Duncan demonstrated leadership skills both on and off the field. Duncan just returned from a semester abroad in New Zealand where he studied the country's natural history and culture while learning invaluable outdoor leadership and survival skills. He was undoubtedly full of life and eager to embark on each new adventure before him.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my sincerest condolences to the Gigerich and Dirk families and to all those who were fortunate enough to know Duncan. His memory will live on through the many friends, family, and places that experienced Duncan's loving spirit and immense appreciation for the outdoors.

May he rest in peace.

CONGRATULATING DEPUTY CHIEF GARAVEN ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Paul Garaven on his retirement from the Tustin Police Department.

Deputy Chief Garaven has served over 30 years at the Tustin Police Department beginning in 1987 as a part-time volunteer reservist. Since then, he has held numerous positions within the department, including time spent undercover with the special investigations unit.

No matter the title Deputy Chief Garaven held, he devoted every day of his career to making the city of Tustin

a safer and better place for all. On July 3, Deputy Chief Garaven will end his long and impressive career at the Tustin Police Department.

Thankfully, the image of a young undercover officer will remain to inspire the next generation of officers at the police department to strive for greatness in everything they do.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Deputy Chief Garaven on an outstanding 30-year career serving the city of Tustin. I wish him the absolute best as he begins the next great chapter of his life.

ENSURING SAFE DRINKING WATER

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I visited Flint, Michigan, where I met with neighbors and residents, one of whom was named Joyce.

Joyce is one of the more than 100,000 residents in Flint who have and continue to endure a life-threatening water crisis in their city which has gone on for years. Like too many families in Flint, Joyce's family has suffered incredible loss due to the criminal contamination of Flint's water.

Joyce's son's name is Joseph. He was a father of three, and as any of us would, he believed that the water that he drank, bathed, and cooked with—the water that he gave to his children—was clean. He had no reason to believe otherwise.

But after the city of Flint changed its water source from Detroit's water system to Flint River in 2014 to cut costs, Joseph began to develop rashes and bacteria that ate away at his flesh forcing him to tape his skin together on his face and on his back with band-aids.

It was so bad that his doctors kept asking him if he had traveled to a Third World country recently. Where in the world had he been that had caused his organs to deteriorate as rapidly as they were?

Joseph died leaving behind his three children; his family; and his mother, Joyce, who continues to keep his memory alive.

Joseph's story is tragic and heart-wrenching, and the sad part is that this is not a one-off case. Samples of drinking water from Flint found 13,000 parts per billion of lead in the community's water, which is nearly 900 times higher than the EPA's maximum limit of 15 parts per billion.

Scientific evidence shows that this lead contamination has killed at least a dozen people in Flint from Legionnaires' disease. It has deteriorated the short- and long-term health of tens of thousands of people in the community, including at least 9,000 children under the age of 6.

It has created ripple effects causing fetal death and lower fertility rates that continue to have an impact on those who are affected and will con-

tinue to have an impact on this community for generations to come.

Now, there are other cases of other illnesses such as cancers and things that are not even being tracked but are likely related to this contaminated water, and that will continue.

It has been over 1,500 days since this crisis began and the people of Flint today still do not have clean water. Understandably, they don't trust their government to tell them the truth after they have been told the water is clean and safe time and again, only to show that it is not and people continue to get sick.

These are the same officials who decided to put cost savings over human lives who later reassured the community that the water was safe when they knew that it wasn't. Now, despite this heartache, death, and destruction, those responsible in local, State, and Federal Government have not been held accountable for creating and perpetuating this horrifying crisis.

Poisoning over 100,000 people through their water is criminal, yet not a single person has been charged. Not only that, but the State has declared the water in Flint to be lead-free and has shut down the only bottled distribution facility in the city. The need is still there, so we have churches and volunteers in the city who are coming together and cobbling together a means to distribute bottled water in whatever way that they can, taking care of each other, and demanding accountability for those responsible for this devastation.

Understandably, they feel they have been forgotten, that their voices are not being heard, and that they have been left behind. All they are asking is that this country—our country—hear their personal stories and shine a light on the problems that still continue.

We understand that this is not a problem isolated to Flint, Michigan, but is a problem that faces communities all across the country. We know that Flint is not alone. With the aging and crumbling infrastructure in this country, we know that too many of our communities don't have safe water to drink. We need Federal investment in our country's dangerously dilapidated water infrastructure now.

In my home State of Hawaii alone, it is estimated that we will need over \$1 billion in drinking water investment over the next 20 years just to ensure that our people have safe water to drink.

I am a co-sponsor of the WATER Act which will make these critical improvements to our drinking water and wastewater services, replace old, lead-ridden pipes, and stop sewage overflows and other problems that are contaminating our national water infrastructure.

We must hold those responsible for the poisoning of Flint accountable for the lives that they have ruined. Along with passing the WATER Act into law, we need to expand water testing in

high-risk areas. We need to send a message to this country that we stand together. Water is life. We cannot survive without it.

□ 1030

RECOGNIZING THE YOUTH POLICE ACADEMY

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Youth Police Academy of the Falls Township Police Department, a 10-day program beginning its 2018 session in mid-July. This program teaches its students Pennsylvania State laws and gives them lessons on patrol scenarios, crime scene investigations, and the use of force.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share with you that this educational experience for Bucks County youth has received over \$6,000 in community support. Much of this money was raised through a 5K run and walk event in Fallsington, organized by Marty McLoughlin and Linda Stout, the co-owners of a local small business, Extreme Fitness Personal Training.

I commend the work of Police Chief Bill Wilcox and the entire Falls Township Police Department for supporting our community's youth in their personal and professional growth and respect for law enforcement.

I would like to recognize Marty and Linda for their hard work and generosity, and I encourage all in our community to follow their lead.

RECOGNIZING DR. ROBERT FRASER

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a public servant in our community for his dedication to improving the lives and educational experiences of Bucks County students.

Dr. Robert Fraser, the superintendent of the Council Rock School District, recently became one of only 30 school superintendents in the United States who have successfully completed the National Superintendent Certification Program.

This elite program helps bring education professionals up to speed on the various issues that have recently presented themselves in the American school system. It covers such facets as instructional leadership, budget management, and using cutting-edge technology to ensure that Council Rock students and faculty are fully equipped to use the most effective resources to assist in the learning process.

I commend Dr. Fraser for his commitment to our community's students, and I would like to thank Jerold Grupp and the entire Council Rock School Board for all of their work.

RECOGNIZING KRISTIAN FALKENSTEIN

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the heroic actions of an individual from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, for which he was awarded the Carnegie Medal from the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission, which

seeks to recognize acts of civilian bravery. Kristian Falkenstein of Newtown played a critical role in saving the life of a 32-year-old man who was swept out to sea on the Jersey shore last year.

After seeing a man being swept out to sea, Kristian immediately sprang into action, swimming out to save this man. When Kristian reached him, he was barely above water. Despite the tall waves and strong rip current, Kristian was able to keep him afloat for several minutes until two lifeguards and a responding police officer were able to swim out to them with flotation devices to assist until the Coast Guard was able to respond.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that all individuals have recovered from this ordeal. I commend Kristian for his tremendous act of bravery, which undoubtedly saved a life that day.

Kristian, your community and your country are extremely proud of you.

CIVILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again, I am proud to rise and stand in the well of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of those who have called for civility. I compliment them for calling for civility. I think civility is appropriate at all times, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do have to ask: Where were you when the President of the United States of America stood before law enforcement officers and said: "You don't have to be so nice when you have a person within your care, custody, and control?"—paraphrasing him, of course. Where were you?

Where was your compassion for the many people who have been victims of brutality at the hands of the constabulary?

Where is your compassion for all of the people who understand that that was a message, whether intended or not, to the constabulary, to the police, that you can abuse people who are in your care, custody, and control? Where were you? Why didn't you speak out?

Where was your sense of outrage as it relates to the President of the United States of America encouraging persons to assault people who were within the care, custody, and control of the police?

Encouraging people to do something unconstitutional, it would have been and is still unconstitutional to assault people who are in your care, custody, and control if you are a peace officer. So where were you?

Where were you when the President said there were some nice people among those at Charlottesville, among those who happened to be in the KKK, the neo-Nazis, those who were espousing harm to people?

As you know, a woman lost her life in Charlottesville. Where were you?

Why didn't you come out strongly against the President of the United States of America? Where were you?

And then, my dear brothers and sisters, my friends across the aisle, why is it that you can find reason to condemn others and propose a resolution, but you propose not one single resolution for the President, who has consistently and persistently created levels of incivility that have emanated to the extent that some people may have been harmed already? Where were you?

Why is it such that you can be outraged now, but you couldn't be outraged then? Where are you now as he is putting his bigotry into policy? Where are you?

Why won't you stand up to this President? Are you aiding and abetting? Are you a part of the President's support system to implement the bigotry that he is putting into policy?

It is being done when the President met with those persons at the White House to talk about immigration and then called certain countries in Africa s—hole countries.

Now, ironically, he wants to do away with the diversity visas, which happen to impact people who may be in Africa. Where were you? Why won't you stand up? Why would you want to implement this level of bigotry into policy?

I commend you and I am proud of you for wanting civility. I stand for civility. But I also know this. Those who make peaceful protests impossible make other forms of protest inevitable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

COMBATING OPIOIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the opioid crisis that is devastating families and communities all across our country, including my fair State of North Carolina and my district in western North Carolina.

Like the rest of the country, North Carolina has not escaped the opioid epidemic. My State has seen a terrifying rise in the number of opioid-related deaths. From 1999 to 2016, the number of deaths tied to opioids grew more than 800 percent.

In 2016 alone, there were almost 2,000 opioid deaths in North Carolina. In just one of the counties I represent, Gaston County, the number of dispensed opioid pills rose to more than 20.5 million pills. That is in a county of just over 200,000 people. That same county experienced a thirteenfold jump in heroin deaths, as well.

While I can list facts all day, it is only by talking to the loved ones who have lost family members due to opioid addiction or those who have come

through addiction and are on the other side that you can truly understand the devastating effects of this crisis. Take, for example, one of my constituents, Jennifer Kline.

Jennifer lost her brother, Jake, to opioid addiction. Before Jake became an addict, Jennifer and her brother shared a very, very close relationship. But opioid addiction turned him into a person she barely knew. Even though Jake went to rehab and had a family who supported him through this whole process throughout his addiction, he still lost the battle against opioids.

I had the honor of meeting with Jennifer. She helped me and my staff host a workshop for local law enforcement in my district, where she shared the heartbreaking story of Jake's addiction. Jake's and her story is a powerful reminder that we must do more to address this epidemic. We are not doing enough. The human toll of this crisis is very, very real, indeed.

Like Jennifer, I have been working hard to help raise awareness in my district, the 10th District of North Carolina, against the dangers of opioid addiction. I have been working with local businesses, law enforcement officials, and other community leaders to combat this crisis: I have hosted roundtables and helped facilitate discussions between community leaders on different ways we can work together to combat this crisis and this epidemic; I have been there as local municipalities have received funds for tools that enable safe disposal of unused prescriptions, as well.

Over the past 2 years, there have been dozens of bills passed in the House that will help people like Jake and provide support for family members like Jennifer. These bills address this issue from all sides. Some of these bills help with the prevention of addiction; others ensure everyone has access to treatment and help facilitate their recovery; still, others provide important support to communities affected so that they can have the tools and resources they need to combat this epidemic.

Last Friday, these bills were passed in the House of Representatives together in a bill, H.R. 6, the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act. It is now headed to the United States Senate and, hopefully, to the President's desk for signature.

This is an important, holistic step that this Chamber has taken on a bipartisan basis to help combat the opioid epidemic and help prevent the tragedy experienced by the Kline family from happening to other families in this country.

We all have stories. We all have loved ones who have been affected by this crisis. Congress must do more. We will continue this fight until we eradicate this epidemic once and for all.

IMMIGRATION AND GOP'S ATTACK ON WORKING PEOPLE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the outright assault on working people in America by the Trump administration.

When candidate Trump ran and carried States like Ohio, Michigan, and Wisconsin, he promised to renegotiate NAFTA to secure U.S. jobs and stop outsourcing. He said he would fight to raise people's paychecks.

Well, wages aren't keeping up with the cost of living as workers backslide on hourly wages, while healthcare and prescription drug costs rise and retirement benefits are being cut.

This week, Harley Davidson just announced it will outsource hundreds of jobs because of the Trump trade war. Meanwhile, the NAFTA trade deficit remains far too high under the Trump administration. That means more lost U.S. jobs and a diminished middle class.

Now, why has President Trump delayed NAFTA renegotiations so critical to creating a level playing field both in our country and across our continent?

Instead of renegotiating NAFTA to heal these gaping deficits and to prevent pitting one group of workers against another on this continent, he is targeting the lowest wage workers in the Americas and tearing them apart from their children, their families, and their communities. Most are agricultural workers who work in grueling jobs, for which U.S. citizens rarely apply.

□ 1045

Let me bring you to Ohio. Just in the past 3 weeks, Ohio communities have faced six massive worker raids at two Corso Lawn and Garden centers and at four Fresh Mark animal slaughter facilities.

America has a choice: We can either grow and process our food and floriculture inside this country; or, if we fail to tend it, we will outsource more and more of our production and be forced to import more food and cede more jobs that relate to agriculture.

These worker raids create a climate of fear where workers are too afraid to stand up for their rights, to report wage theft, or to redress dangerous work conditions facing them.

Working in a meat slaughterhouse is among the most dangerous jobs in the United States of America. NAFTA forces workers who work in these jobs to exist in a shadow economy and be treated as, yes, less than human.

The raw truth is NAFTA was purposefully designed to create an exodus of millions of displaced small farmers in the Mexican countryside who have become an exploitable underclass of vast dimension across this continent. Millions and millions of small farmers were turned off their land, forming an endless pool of cheap, exploitable labor

in the Americas. I call it the most significant continental sacrilege in my lifetime.

Voila. There it is, the cold, hard truth of NAFTA's underbelly, still left unaddressed after a quarter century.

Their lives are viewed as cheap, those human lives given no value in this continent's enormous economy. Yet we wouldn't eat without them. We wouldn't recreate without them.

Where is President Trump? Instead of fixing this NAFTA problem, he has sidelined NAFTA renegotiation. Instead of fixing this problem, congressional Republicans passed a GOP tax scam that gives away trillions to the ultra-wealthy—the top 1 percent got 83 percent of the benefits—while adding trillions to our deficit. Meanwhile, workers are facing increased health costs, cutbacks in retirement benefits, unaffordable medicine and healthcare, and rising education costs for their children.

How about that? Instead of carefully targeted trade relief and going after closed global markets, the Trump administration starts a trade war with most of our allies.

It isn't productive that this President of the United States is offending the President of Mexico and the Prime Minister of Canada. Really? Our closest neighbors.

Young people are expressing workplace frustration as well with the jobs in the so-called gig economy with Uber or elsewhere, where a 20-year-old, sure, can work, but with far fewer benefits and much less security and stability.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for a better deal for workers across this continent, starting with an enforceable NAFTA trade pact that has strong labor provisions and a labor secretariat on both the agriculture and industrial side.

I am one of the Democrats willing to work with Republicans and roll up my sleeves to reach that compromise, as difficult as I know it will be.

TAX REFORM AND ECONOMIC HEALTH

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, proud to share a snapshot of rising wages, more jobs, and increasing opportunity in the Fourth Congressional District of Washington, which I have the distinct pleasure of representing.

In the city of Yakima, unemployment is at 5.5 percent, as reported in April by the Washington Employment Security Department. That number is reportedly the lowest it has been for that month since electronic reporting began in 1990. Yakima County is the most populous county in central Washington and had a May unemployment rate at 6.0 percent, which is the lowest rate in decades.

In another major population center in Washington, the Tri-Cities, unem-

ployment was at 5.2 percent in May. Wages in the Tri-Cities area are up 3.8 percent over 2017 and are among the fastest growing in the State.

The latest jobs report showed decreasing unemployment rates across my district in every single county, with Okanogan at 6.3 percent; Grant, 6.1; Franklin, 5.5; Douglas at 5.2; Benton at 5.1; Adams at 4.8; and Walla Walla at 4.3.

New jobs in construction, food manufacturing, and professional business services are largely driving the regional growth in the labor force. These numbers are more than just statistics, Mr. Speaker. Increasing employment opportunities mean families can provide a more secure future for their children. Graduating students are able to choose from more options after graduation.

My constituents deserve a Federal Government whose policies foster this kind of growth through lower taxes and smarter regulation. We should encourage entrepreneurs by helping, not hurting, growth.

Since tax reform was made law, local businesses in my district, such as Irwin Research & Development and Abbott's Printing in Yakima, have expressed optimism at the prospect of increasing investment and giving earnings to workers rather than the Federal Government.

The ability of businesses to write off the full value of equipment and other assets will help Buhrmaster Baking Company in Yakima plan for equipment upgrades. Chukar Cherries in Prosser has announced a \$1.8 million, 12,000-square-foot expansion, in large part due to tax reform.

Cacchiotti Orthodontics announced hourly raises for their Moses Lake employees thanks to tax reform. Pacific Power, which serves Yakima County, announced that it will pass tax reform savings on to its ratepayers. Washington Federal, with branches in Moses Lake and Quincy, announced 5 percent merit-based increases in wages for all employees earning less than \$100,000, as well as an investment in employee training programs.

Pacific Northwest companies such as Alaska Airlines, Costco, Boeing, Premera Blue Cross, and Starbucks have announced millions in increased benefits, raises, employee education, and nonprofit donations.

To sum it all up, central Washington's economy is experiencing growth, and that is good news for workers and for their families. I will continue to work on behalf of my constituents to promote economic opportunity, and I am proud that this tax reform is working as it was promised to work.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Dr. Jack Trieber, North Valley Baptist Church, Santa Clara, California, offered the following prayer:

Father, I thank You so much, Almighty God, that we can come into Your presence and pray for this great body of people that serve us.

We thank You for our Congressmen today. We pray that You keep them safe, men and women, their children, their mates, their grandchildren. We pray for our country today that it would have this day of safety and security.

Lord, it is my prayer that as our leaders serve today, that You give them wisdom, that You give them patience, that You give them kindness and understanding.

May we remember the words of the Scripture that: "Righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." Remember the Bible says today that: "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

We thank You for America. We thank You for the privilege of prayer in this very sacred assembly.

In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. CICILLINE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING DR. JACK TRIEBER

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to introduce my friend and constituent, Dr. Jack Trieber, pastor of North Valley Baptist Church in Santa

Clara, California in my district. I thank him for his words of wisdom and comfort, and for joining us to deliver the opening prayer in the House today.

Pastor Trieber has been a source of strength and guidance for my constituents for more than four decades. He is a personal friend and counselor and source of strength to me. He and his wife, Cindie, have been friends since I entered public service, and I appreciate that Pastor Trieber accompanied me to last year's annual National Prayer Breakfast to join leaders from across the country in discussing the importance of faith to the strength of our Nation.

Under the pastor's leadership, North Valley Baptist Church has grown from an assembly of 22 people in 1976, the year I was born, to a current average of 3,000 in attendance each Sunday. He is a true patriot.

He believes in this country, and it is a real honor to have had him open our House with his prayers.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

TAX CUTS ARE WORKING

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

MR. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, it has only been 6 months since the new tax reform law was put into place, but already, we are seeing many positive economic outcomes.

Unemployment is at the lowest rate in 18 years; Hispanic and African American unemployment has reached a record low; over 1 million jobs have been created; and there are now more job openings than job seekers. Wages are increasing, and Americans are seeing more money in their wallets.

On top of that, people are also seeing lower utility bills, keeping more of their hard-earned money. Small businesses are increasingly optimistic about the economy, reporting higher wages for their workers and plans for expansion.

Mr. Speaker, the promising results we have seen in such a short time show that the tax cuts are working. And this is just the beginning. Let's take these results, build on them, and continue to better the lives of the American people.

COVERAGE FOR PREEXISTING CONDITIONS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act improved access to quality healthcare for millions of

Americans. One of the most important protections in this law is that insurance companies can no longer deny people coverage because they have a preexisting condition.

Millions of Americans with arthritis, cancer, diabetes, mental illness, and other preexisting conditions have benefited from this requirement. And that is why it is so disturbing that earlier this month the Trump administration went to court to argue that insurance companies should no longer have to cover people with preexisting conditions.

If they succeed, it will further unravel the Affordable Care Act. It will be harder for individuals and small businesses to buy health insurance. Some experts believe that there will be even more Americans without health coverage than ever before. This is wrong. The President is putting the interests of health insurance companies and health insurance company CEOs ahead of American consumers.

Republicans in Congress should be demanding that this President stop. They should demand that their constituents have access to the best healthcare possible, but, instead, they are silent in the face of a President trying to take away coverage for pre-existing medical conditions.

It is wrong. We can do better.

PRAYERS FOR KATIE ARRINGTON

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, South Carolinians extend sincere thoughts and prayers to State Representative Katie Arrington, who was injured in a tragic auto accident on Friday. We are grateful to learn that Katie will make a full recovery.

On June 12, Katie achieved the Republican nomination for Congress for the historic First District of South Carolina. When successful in November, she will be the first Republican Federal elected official in the history of South Carolina, in the tradition of Ambassador Nikki Haley who was South Carolina's first female Governor in 340 years.

Also, yesterday, Republicans nominated Pamela Evette to be the first female Republican Lieutenant Governor ever, and Lexington Republicans selected Paula Rawl Calhoun for the South Carolina State House.

Katie served as an executive with military defense contracts, ensuring servicemembers will have the tools necessary to succeed. She is on the board of many organizations, including Women In Defense, Charleston Defense Contractors Association, and South Carolina Cyber.

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

Congratulations on yesterday's primary victories by Governor Henry

McMaster, Attorney General Alan Wilson, and congressional nominee William Timmons.

IMPROVE OUR HEALTHCARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the more than 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions who are under attack from the Trump administration.

Some of these people have chronic health conditions such as asthma and diabetes. Some are waging courageous fights against cancer. Some are tackling challenges with mental health or substance abuse. These are our family and friends. They are our neighbors, our coworkers, our caregivers. They are us.

Sadly, if the administration has its way, they will once more be subjected to discrimination that could deprive them of coverage, condemn them to a lifetime's worth of staggering medical bills, and push their families into devastating bankruptcy.

One of my constituents in Highland Park who found coverage through the ACA wrote me:

My preexisting condition is not a result of my lifestyle choices, as some like to believe. I don't deserve to be demonized and financially thrashed just because of something I cannot control.

I agree. Seventy percent of the public also support making sure people with preexisting conditions have protections. I urge the Trump administration to abandon its legal effort to undermine the ACA. Enough with the sabotage.

We owe it to these 130 million people to do better. Instead of building barriers to healthcare, let's work together and improve our healthcare system.

WELCOMING CONGRESSIONAL ART COMPETITION WINNER MEGAN SMITH TO THE CAPITOL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I welcome Megan Smith to the Capitol. Megan is the winner of the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District's Congressional Artwork Competition.

The annual art competition, organized by the Congressional Institute, showcases the artwork of high school students across every congressional district in the country.

Megan just graduated from Bellefonte Area High School earlier this month. Her artwork titled, "Spoons," is a drawing of five different spoons on top of blue, pink, and white collage paper.

All of the winning pieces will be displayed for the year in the Cannon tun-

nel where they will be viewed by Members of Congress, staff, and the many visitors of the Capitol every day.

I am looking forward to spending time with Megan and her parents at this afternoon's reception where she and her fellow winners from across the country will be honored for their work.

I congratulate Megan and all of the students who participated in the competition, and I am excited to see all of the new artwork hanging in the tunnel.

STATEHOOD FOR PUERTO RICO

(Mrs. MURPHY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for bipartisan legislation to begin Puerto Rico's transition to statehood.

There are over 3 million U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico, and over 5 million individuals of Puerto Rican heritage in the States. My Florida district is home to more Puerto Ricans than any other district in the country.

I care deeply about Puerto Rico because my constituents care deeply about Puerto Rico. But every Member of Congress should care about Puerto Ricans because they are our fellow citizens. We are part of the same American family.

Puerto Rico has been a territory for 120 years. Its residents are treated unequally under key Federal laws. This impairs economic progress and quality of life, spurring migration to the mainland. And even though Puerto Ricans serve in the military with distinction, they cannot vote for their President and Commander-in-Chief. They have no Senators, and have only one nonvoting delegate in the House.

The hard truth is that Puerto Rico's lack of political power too often makes it an afterthought in Washington, as the Federal Government's poor response to Hurricane Maria made painfully clear.

I support statehood because I support equality. The people of Puerto Rico deserve the same rights and responsibilities as their fellow citizens in Florida and every other State.

Puerto Rico has earned its star on the American flag.

RECOGNIZING THOSE AFFECTED BY THE EASTPOINT FIRE

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the hardworking people of Eastpoint, Florida, who lost their homes, their belongings, and even their livelihoods to a devastating fire this week.

This past weekend a fire broke out in Franklin County, which destroyed more than 40 homes and almost 1,000 acres. My heart goes out to those

whose lives have been forever changed by this horrible and unexpected wildfire. My office stands ready to assist them in any way we can.

Thank you to all of our first responders, volunteer firefighters, and local law enforcement for your heroic efforts in containing this blaze. Your quick actions saved many lives.

Thank you also to Franklin County Sheriff, A. J. "Tony" Smith, Franklin County Emergency Management Director Pam Brownell, local community leaders, the Salvation Army, and the American Red Cross, all of whom stepped up and provided aid and comfort to those who need it the most.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in praying for the victims and their families during this time of loss.

POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, 20 veterans commit suicide in the United States every day. This is not only a crisis; it is a national shame.

Today, June 27, is Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day. We need to come together as Democrats and Republicans to help those suffering from PTSD.

Too many veterans suffering alone in the dark are not eligible for VA benefits, or are unable to navigate the VA bureaucracy.

I am proud to have introduced the bipartisan Mental Health Services for All Veterans Act, H.R. 2736, which would provide every member of the military mental health services, whether Active Duty, Reserve, or National Guard, even if they were less-than-honorably discharged.

Mental health, PTSD, 20 suicides a day—this crisis in a community of heroes must be addressed.

□ 1215

HONORING WILLIAM DALLUGE

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, William Dalluge, Jr., a lifetime resident of Blue Mound, Illinois, who retired as Pleasant View Township clerk in April.

William, who is known to everyone as "Whompie," is a staple in the Blue Mound community. Born and raised there, Whompie has always called Blue Mound home. Even from a young age, he knew the importance of giving back to his community. In 1961, he started a small business by leasing and operating the Standard Gas station in town for 9 years. The following 16 years, he was co-owner of the Blue Mound Furniture Store.

What is most remarkable about Whompie is that he has spent nearly all his life in the service of others. Not only is he a U.S. Army veteran, but Whompie sat on the Blue Mound Town Board for 4 years, serving as the village president another 4.

He volunteered his time as a Boy Scout troop leader and has been actively involved in the Interchurch Food Pantry since 1984. For the past 29 years, the citizens of Blue Mound have known Whompie as their Pleasant View Township clerk until his retirement this spring.

However, if you ask him, Whompie's greatest accomplishment has been his nearly 69-year marriage to his wife, Nelda. Together, they have three children, six grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren.

Whompie, congratulations on a well-earned retirement. Best wishes to you and your family.

FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN U.S. ELECTIONS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the 2016 election and its fallout highlighted what many Americans already knew, that special interests bankroll candidates in exchange for expected favors down the road and loopholes allow foreign governments to influence our elections. Look no further than the pervasive impact of Russian-sponsored political ads on Facebook in 2016.

My bill, the REFUSE Act, Repelling Encroachment by Foreigners into U.S. Elections, tightens campaign finance laws and lobbyist disclosure rules to protect our democracy from foreign influence.

First, to stem the bleed of special interest money into our elections, our bill sets a reasonable limit on foreign ownership within corporate PACs and 501(c)(4) nonprofits that spend on our elections. Second, the bill tightens reporting requirements for foreign agents and gives the Justice Department real enforcement authority to go after the bad guys.

Until we repeal Citizens United, which threw open the floodgates for billionaires and special interests to spend unlimited secret money on our elections, we need commonsense legislation like the REFUSE Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in fortifying our democratic Republic against foreign influence.

HONORING OFFICER MATHEW MAZANY

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I want to honor the life and service of a brave constituent of mine, Mentor police officer Mathew Mazany.

Officer Mazany, a 14-year veteran officer, was killed in a tragic hit-and-run on Sunday morning while helping with a traffic stop.

He achieved his dream by following in the footsteps of his father, who also served as a police officer for 34 years in Maple Heights, not too far from Mentor. His coworkers and those who knew him best described him as a happy-go-lucky kind of guy who enjoyed protecting the Mentor community.

Officer Mazany leaves behind a son, brother, father, and countless others who had the pleasure of knowing him. His legacy and dedication to public service will not be forgotten.

My prayers are with Officer Mathew Mazany's family, his friends, the city of Mentor, and the Mentor Police Department during this difficult time.

SUPPORTING OUR MILITARY

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H.R. 6157, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

Over the last year and a half, our unified government has taken the necessary steps to unleash the economy and foster growth here in the United States. Because of this work, our economy is strong today.

Now we must do the work required to ensure that our military is strong, too, especially after the damaging sequestration cuts and funding limitations placed on our military by the previous administration. As a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I have been proud to have a seat at the table through this process. I appreciate the leadership of Chairwoman KAY GRANGER as we work to properly fund our military.

I am grateful to serve Alabama's Second District that is home to Maxwell-Gunter Air Force Base and Fort Rucker. I am proud that this bill provides the resources to support their critical missions.

Mr. Speaker, one of Congress' most fundamental constitutional responsibilities is to provide for the common defense. This bill fulfills that responsibility and ensures that our military remains the tip of the spear. I will proudly vote for H.R. 6157 to properly fund our military.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6157, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JUNE 29, 2018, THROUGH JULY 9, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 964 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 964

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and available pro forma amendments described in section 3 of House Resolution 961. Each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except amendments described in section 3 of House Resolution 961, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from June 29, 2018, through July 9, 2018 —

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague from California (Mrs. TORRES) 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

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 964, which provides for the consideration of additional amendments to H.R. 6157, the Department of Defense Appropriations

Act for fiscal year 2019. This rule makes in order an additional 29 amendments: 8 Republican, 16 Democratic, and 5 bipartisan amendments.

Mr. Speaker, as we discussed on this floor yesterday and many times previously, providing funding that our men and women in uniform need to defend this great Republic is by far the most important responsibility we have as Members of the United States Congress. Today's rule gives us the opportunity to get the input and hear the voices of additional Members as we listen to and consider their amendments to H.R. 6157.

In the National Defense Strategy that was released late last year, Secretary Mattis described the situation facing our Armed Forces this way: "Today, we are emerging from a period of strategic atrophy, aware that our competitive military advantage has been eroding. We are facing increased global disorder, characterized by decline in the longstanding rules-based international order—creating a security environment more complex and volatile than any we have experienced in recent memory."

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I would say more than any that we have lived through and any that we have existed in since World War II.

Without the kind of sustained and predictable investment that appropriations bills and the appropriation process needs, we will simply not be able to restore readiness to modernize our military or to maintain our strategic advantage. We will rapidly lose our ability to project our forces as well as our military advantage.

We cannot allow that to happen. The rule and the underlying bill that we are debating today are both crucial steps to continue the progress that we have already made and crucial steps toward ensuring that the commitment that we made in order to provide 2 years of funding for our men and women in uniform is kept.

This bill helps provide the very resources and modernization that the National Defense Strategy said were so crucially needed. We have to make sure that our Department of Defense can provide combat-credible military forces needed to deter war and protect the security of our Nation.

Today's rule, Mr. Speaker, gives us the opportunity to debate this important piece of legislation and get the input from Members of this body who would like to make it even better.

One of the amendments, Mr. Speaker, made in order by this rule was offered by my colleague from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and cosponsored by a bipartisan group of Members. It would allow the Department of Defense to dual buy CVN-80 and CVN-81. These are our next two aircraft carriers. The Navy has stated that this dual buy authority could likely save taxpayers \$2.5 billion on these two aircraft carriers.

This amendment serves two purposes. It helps ensure that we are using tax-

payer resources wisely, and it helps move us toward the Navy's necessary and stated goal of a 355-ship Navy.

There are several other good amendments, Mr. Speaker, made in order by this rule, some that I probably won't support. But the rule takes serious ideas about how we can strengthen the Nation's Armed Forces, how we can make the defense of this Nation our priority, and brings them to the floor of this House for our consideration.

I look forward to considering each amendment and completing the Defense Appropriations process in this House. The work we are doing here is vital, but it is only part of the job, Mr. Speaker. We have to pass the appropriations bill through this body, and then we have to make sure that our colleagues on the other side of this building, our colleagues in the Senate, do the same. We can't hold funding for our military hostage to other priorities, even for additional domestic spending. We simply must provide reliable funding at necessary levels for the men and women in uniform who are putting their lives on the line for all of us.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule that will allow consideration of additional amendments to H.R. 6157.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order 29 amendments to H.R. 6157, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2019. The underlying legislation is the product of bipartisan negotiations, which have been going on for months. Bipartisan negotiations are a really good thing, and I am glad that, on this one issue, we are finding ways to work together.

In particular, I want to recognize the work that Representative AGUILAR, Representative HURD, and many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have been doing to create a path forward and look for a solution to President Trump's self-created Dreamer crisis. That is what we are supposed to be doing here: working together to solve problems.

Unfortunately, this Republican leadership doesn't believe in working with the other side. They are only interested in negotiating with their own. So it is not surprising that it isn't going very well. That is why they pulled their own immigration bill last week.

Maybe the Republican leadership, which has blocked the bipartisan Dream Act time and time again, and which has blocked the bipartisan USA Act time and time again, should trust their Members to craft and vote on compromise legislation.

□ 1230

But they don't have the courage or the vision to do that, do they?

Now we have another crisis, which, again, the President has created, a crisis that has outraged our constituents. Thousands of children, even infants and toddlers, are ripped from their parents at our southern border, children who have done absolutely nothing wrong, children who did not choose to come here on their own, kids too young to know the name of the country that they came from, too young to know what asylum is, too young to know what illegal entry means. Some of these kids only know two words: "mom" and "dad."

We have heard the recordings of these children crying out for their parents while being made fun of. Many of us have visited the detention centers, and it is heartbreaking and it is unnecessary.

So, while I congratulate the Appropriations Committee for their hard work on the defense bill, I have to remind the Speaker that we have 95 days to finish our work for funding the Federal Government. But I would challenge my colleagues to imagine one day, a single day, without their child, unsure if they would ever see them again.

We have some time to do the defense bill, but on the issue of family separation, we cannot afford to wait another day. Congress should be addressing this crisis today. It is not going to be easy. This administration clearly did not think through this policy that they have created.

Right now, we have children in HHS care, but where are their parents? Some are in custody of the U.S. Marshals or ICE, already deported, or maybe some are free on bond.

HHS said yesterday that they were not reuniting kids with their parents who are in detention. What does that mean? Are they going to be free? If not, what is the plan?

Let's look at the best-case scenario: a parent who gets out on bond and goes to HHS and asks for their child is told, "Show us your documents. Prove you are really the parent," and this parent who has been in custody has nothing.

Where is the plan to help these parents obtain their documents? Where are these plans to help these children reunite with their parents?

Does the administration even know where all the parents are and how they are supposed to be reunited with their kids?

How are they keeping track of the babies, the babies who are simply too young to even know their name?

We have many unanswered questions. We should be making sure those kids get to their parents, making sure that every single one of those children is accounted for. That is doing our job.

Instead, we are passing another appropriations bill with the full knowledge that we will probably do what we have done every year that I have been here: We will pass a CR at the end of

the fiscal year, and then we will probably pass another CR, and then another, and then another, and then another, because we can't legislate together.

This rule makes in order 29 amendments, but not a single one of them deals with the issues of the kids. Why not allow a vote on the amendment I offered with Representative SCHIFF to prohibit detaining children at military facilities?

Why not allow a vote on my amendment to block certain Cabinet members from using military aircraft until the children are reunited? Is it more important for Scott Pruitt to get on a plane than for a baby from El Salvador to get back into his mother's arms? or the amendment offered by my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. POLIS? Representative POLIS' amendment would have prohibited the Department of Defense from transferring resources to the Department of Justice to carry out prosecution of migrant families.

Don't our troops need these resources? Shouldn't our military be focused on keeping us safe from ISIS and North Korea, not toddlers and babies?

And why is the Republican leadership afraid to allow us to have a vote? I guess babies are too controversial for the Republican caucus. I guess keeping families together is a poison pill amendment.

By refusing Congress a vote, this House is giving up its responsibility to make immigration laws, plain and simple. This House should be a check on the administration. That is the way the system is supposed to work. But we are not doing that. Instead, by refusing to let us have a vote on the floor, the Republican House majority is endorsing President Trump's family jails.

Mr. Speaker, this House majority owns this crisis. Let me be clear: A vote for this rule is a vote for more of President Trump's cruelty to these babies. It is a vote to keep innocent children from their parents.

This House has the power to reunite these families. This House has the power to end separation. This House has the power to stop hateful immigration policies.

But this House won't act. Because of that, thousands of families may be destroyed forever. We must defeat this rule and give this House an opportunity to act.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that this House actually is going to be taking up a bill that addresses these issues. Mr. GOODLATTE's bill will come up within the next hour or so here on this floor. The bill itself would require that the Department of Homeland Security maintain the care and custody of aliens together, with their children, as well as providing funding for DHS family residential centers.

So I think that it is fair to say that there is bipartisan concern for the plight of these children, the plight of these families. I think all of us who are mothers understand the emotions involved here and understand that we don't want to perpetuate a situation that, in fact, also was occurring when President Obama was in office.

But I think it is also important to note that we have got to secure our border and we have got to be in a position where we are recognizing that people who come here illegally cannot be allowed to stay. People who come here illegally must, in fact, be deported, must, in fact, be apprehended.

We need to end, as we have, the practice of catch and release that we saw during the Obama administration. It is a security issue for us.

The pain and the emotion that we all feel for the families that have been separated I think we all also feel for the angel families, the families that President Trump has met with, the families that have been the victims of violence perpetuated by people who have come to this country illegally.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is absolutely the wrong thing to do, as my colleague urges the notion that we should defeat this rule so that we can address immigration. It just simply is wrong on a procedural matter. We ought to, in fact, support this rule, pass this rule, not once again hold hostage the men and women in uniform to another issue.

The position of the minority here is apparently that we should stop our bipartisan process and our bipartisan movement on funding the troops so that we can take up an issue that we are already planing to take up. It is not necessary and it is unjustified. I actually would urge exactly the opposite of my colleague from the Rules Committee. We ought to, in fact, pass this rule.

Mr. Speaker, as we think about this issue, we have got to remember that there are families involved not just with respect to the issue of immigration; there are families involved with respect to the men and women who are defending all of us.

I don't think that it is acceptable, I don't think it is justifiable, for us ever to be in a position where we are telling the mother or the father or the spouse of a servicemember that we couldn't get them the funding they needed because our process is broken, that we couldn't get them the funding that they need because we are bickering with each other. I think that is, in fact, absolutely an abrogation of our constitutional responsibilities and duties.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), who is vice chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to complete consideration of the FY 2019 Defense Appropriations bill.

I thank the Rules Committee and all the Members who submitted amend-

ments to the Defense Appropriations bill. I commend the chairman, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Ranking Member LOWEY, Subcommittee Chairwoman GRANGER, and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for their leadership on the FY 2019 Defense Appropriations bill. I would also like to thank our dedicated professional staff who have tirelessly worked on this bill.

I have served on the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for many years, and providing for our men and women in uniform is a privilege and an honor. This bill provides vital funding for our armed services, including a 2.6 percent pay raise. This bill is an investment in our future superiority on land, air, and at sea.

Earlier this year, Secretary Mattis released the National Defense Strategy. As we know, our Secretary of Defense is focused on readiness and lethality. This bill meets the demands of the Department to restore readiness levels, invest in lethality, buy the equipment that will maintain superiority, and provide for the health and welfare of our men and women in uniform.

We are at a unique time in history that demands U.S. leadership throughout the world. As we know too well, a power vacuum breeds instability and extremism. A strong U.S. military with our allies creates stability.

After too many years of a budget-driven strategy, this bill reflects the investment needed to maintain and secure U.S. interests around the world. The investment we make here today, about 16 percent of our entire Federal budget, has dividends down the road for many years. The security of our Nation, and the peace of the world, depends on a strong U.S. military.

The last time the House passed a stand-alone Defense Appropriations conference report that was signed into law before the end of the fiscal year was September 2009. Let's turn the page on CRs that cripple the Department and return to regular order.

I again thank my colleagues who crafted this bill, our military leadership, and the men and women of the United States military. I urge passage of the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I absolutely agree that a primary duty of this Congress is to fund the military, absolutely. There are military families serving in our Nation and abroad that deserve to get paid.

So I would like to take this moment of privilege to remind this Congress that, before I got here, my son, who joined the United States Air Force, was going to have his pay withheld. I remember him telling me, Mr. Speaker:

Mom, I signed up to serve our great Nation in the United States Air Force, and I signed up to defend and protect my country. I did not sign up to defend and protect the men of my country, but I signed up to protect all of the people in my country. And I resent Congress withholding my pay or tying my pay to the reproductive rights of women.

So let's keep all of those things in mind when we talk about the priorities of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this Congress once provided a check on excessive executive power. But today, in this House, it is all lapdog and no watchdog. Even terrified toddlers torn from their mother's embrace are not beyond the limit of this Congress.

Until very recently, limitation amendments like those I authored to this bill to protect taxpayers from having funds misused were routinely approved for debate—no more.

□ 1245

Just as Trump undermines our democracy, so too do these House Republicans refusing to permit even the pretense of a fair debate on key national issues.

Having enabled Trump's separation of children from their parents, often with their silence, Republicans have blocked amendments that I and 41 of our colleagues sponsored to prevent our military bases from being converted into internment camps for children and, in some cases, their families.

Our military bases have an important mission. It is to ensure our national security, to ensure the utmost readiness for our troops, who may be called into action in many different parts of the globe at the same time. It is not their job to take care of 20,000 people, as the administration has requested, on two Texas military bases. The function there is a totally different one from that to which we have committed in this defense bill.

These are real people, real children. They are toddlers who have been torn from their parents in places like McAllen, which I once represented; real children who cry themselves to sleep every night, held without their freedom and without their loved ones, while some of my former constituents are shopping right down the street.

My constituents at home now in San Antonio, San Marcos, Lockhart, and Austin care about this. Over 1,000 people have reached out to my office, their hearts breaking for these children.

Trump is truly testing the waters of dehumanization, seeing how many people blink an eye when he calls for suspending due process, guaranteed by our Constitution, for people who don't look like him.

I do believe in a no-tolerance policy. The no-tolerance policy that I support is no tolerance for bigotry, no tolerance for the demonization of foreigners which regularly spews forth from this White House, no tolerance for using cages to hold children as hostages.

No matter how grievous the wrong, how insulting the tweet, my colleagues sit here, idle and silent, silently blocking debate on congressional checks on this authoritarian-loving President who seeks to amass more and more power.

Perhaps what we need in this House is a strong, professional ENT—an ear, nose and throat physician—because Republicans have lost their voice when it comes to standing up to Trump on much of anything. You could say that Trump's got their tongue.

Whatever the reason, they are not there standing up for the children, won't even permit a debate on the issue of whether our military bases should be converted to this perverted purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I will never yield to a President who knows no limits, and we will not yield in raising the issue of these children, their separation, and the detainment of their families indefinitely. We must speak out and use every opportunity afforded in this House to defend their presence and to defend a better policy and the use of our tax dollars for what they were intended, not to detain, indefinitely, these babies.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would thank my colleague very much for her son's service in our Armed Forces, and I would also just note that we agree. We don't think that our military servicemembers' salaries should be held hostage for any issue, no matter the issue. That is why we in this body believe we should pass a stand-alone Defense Appropriations bill. That is why we believe that we ought to pass the rule that we are debating today, so that we can get to the debate and the discussion about the stand-alone Defense Appropriations bill. That is why we believe the Senate should take it up and pass it that way as well.

We shouldn't add any legislation to it. The funding that our men and women in uniform need should not be made a situation where it is held hostage to other political issues. It is simply not justifiable, no matter the issue.

I would note once again, Mr. Speaker, and this is crucially important, that one of the fundamental values that our men and women in uniform are fighting for and defending is the rule of law, and for too long in the previous administration we had policies like catch and release that were sanctioned from the top. We had policies like sanctuary cities that were sanctioned from the top. We had situations, Mr. Speaker, where the laws of the Republic that were passed by this body, passed by the Senate, signed into law by the President, were simply not enforced. That is not a situation that we can allow to continue.

I think it is important that we address the issue of the separation of families at the border. No one wants to see that happen or that continue. I think we need to focus on it. We need to make sure that we come up with solutions for it, like the kinds of solutions that are going to be presented on this floor shortly.

I think, as we do that, we have also got to remember the larger issues involved, including the security of the

Nation. That is not just about the resources that this bill provides; it is also about making sure that our borders are secure.

One of the things that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have refused to deal with and to address time and again is funding for a border wall. President Trump has made clear that part of securing this Nation is providing funding for a border wall. That is something that we have got to make sure we appropriate. That is also something that the bill that we will consider this afternoon does.

I am hopeful that we will see support from the other side of the aisle for a bill that deals with the issue of separating children from families at the border.

I also would point out, Mr. Speaker, that this House has been very dedicated and focused and very active in dealing with the issue of human trafficking. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know very well that many of the situations we are seeing at our border that involve children are not family situations. They are situations where those children are brought here by human traffickers. Those children are brought here to be exploited. That is something we have got to make sure we protect against.

When we as a nation allow sanctuary cities to continue to exist, when we look the other way and say we won't enforce our immigration laws, we are, in fact, perpetuating a system where those children are put at risk, and we are not doing our duty, our fundamental obligation, to protect and defend those children.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the concern for the children of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were as broad as it needs to be, to encompass, frankly, all of the threats that these kids are facing.

I think it is important that we pass this rule, we pass this underlying bill, and we move on to address and focus on the issue of immigration in a way in which Members on both sides of the aisle can agree.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add that I absolutely agree with my colleague from the other side of the aisle on one thing, and that is that we should be absolutely focused and work together on the issues on which we agree, such as the USA Act.

Mr. Speaker, why aren't we allowed to have a vote on the floor when that is bipartisan legislation created by a bipartisan group of Members?

If we want to talk about the rule of law, Mr. Speaker, we can't talk from both ends. Either we support the rule of law or we don't. Yet this Republican Congress, time and time and time again, has been complicit with President Trump and his family's conflicts of interest when it comes to dealing

with China, when it comes to dealing with our trade agreements, when it comes to dealing with Russia and now possibly North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration has ripped thousands of children from their parents' arms at the border, sending them all over the country. Separating children from their parent poses ongoing psychological harm and trauma, yet the government has no clear plans to reunite those families. For that reason, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative BASS' bill, H.R. 6236, the Family Unity Rights and Protection Act, which would require the Federal Government to reunite families which have been forcibly separated at the border.

Mr. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) to discuss this proposal.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, mothers and fathers who sought a safe haven for their children watched helplessly as their children were being snatched away from them by our government.

These families were fleeing unimaginable violence. They had no idea where their infants were being taken. They had no idea the treatment they would receive. These parents, in many instances, still have no idea where their children are located or how to communicate with them.

The Trump administration established no formal process to return these children. I am terrified at the thought that these parents may never see their children again. If the parents are deported and their children are sent all over this country, how will the parents find their children?

Just imagine the mother from El Salvador who is deported back to El Salvador, who came here dirt-poor to begin with. She gets deported back to El Salvador. Her child is sent off to New York. How is she ever supposed to find that child again?

It appears that the only real plan was to separate families as a deterrent to legal immigration. Coming to America should not mean permanently losing your child, especially if you came to America and it was not illegal. If you came in search of asylum, that is not illegal immigration.

The zero-tolerance policy will have a lasting effect. Pediatricians and health experts agree that child-parent separation will result in neurological damage. I will tell you that I have received numerous phone calls from experts, pediatricians, social workers, and child welfare workers.

The other night, I even received a very long email from a distraught

internationally known psychologist, Dr. Phil McGraw. He shared with me his concerns about the impact child-parent separation will have on children. He highlighted that, when children are torn away from their parents and raised in institutions without a stable caregiver, it disrupts the formation of attachments, that children become anxious and fearful, and that this can last for years, if not a lifetime. Dr. Phil also expressed how this impacts a child's brain development, which can lead to negative health and well-being outcomes.

We did this, and now we must undo this. If our government did this policy of separating children from parents, then it should be our government's responsibility to reunite those parents with those children, whether they remain here in the United States or, especially, if they are deported.

This proceeded without a plan, without foresight, and without a second glance at the law or what we stand for as a nation. This is chaos. That is why I am calling for a vote on my bill, H.R. 6236, Family Unity Rights and Protection Act, to require the Federal Government to reunite the parents with the children, to establish a database of children separated from families, and to make sure that parental rights aren't terminated.

We are told that parents can communicate with their children, but let me ask you how a parent in Los Angeles would communicate with a child who is 6 months old in another State.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, my bill also requires a report outlining the short- and long-term effects on these families and proposed solutions.

As it is, our foster care system is already overrun with over 400,000 children. We know that these kids are in detention right now, but ultimately they will wind up in foster care. Because of the opioid crisis, we don't have enough foster homes for kids who actually need to be in care.

The long-term neurological effects that I describe even apply to children who should be removed from home because their parents have either abused or neglected them. So even when the children should be separated, that separation causes tremendous harm.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, if that is what happens to children who should be removed from home, we must call for an end to State-sponsored child abuse, because that is what this policy is. This is our Federal Government that is abusing children.

That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on ordering the previous question.

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

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

Let me remind this body of a brief history of our Nation.

During World War II, this country chose to round up Japanese American citizens and put them in internment camps across the country.

□ 1300

Some were held in my hometown at the Los Angeles County Fairgrounds, in Pomona, California.

In 1944, the Supreme Court ruled in *Korematsu v. United States* that the government had every right to incarcerate families in the best interest of our national security. It was wrong and immoral then, and it is wrong and immoral now, and we look back at Japanese internment as a dark moment in our history.

Just yesterday, the Supreme Court finally rejected the ruling and admitted that it was clearly unconstitutional to forcibly place Japanese Americans in concentration camps—74 years later. That is how long it took for our court system to catch up with the reality and to right a horrible wrong.

We are facing a similar dark period in our country now with what is happening at our southern borders. How long will it take this time for us to realize that what this administration is doing at our southern borders is morally repugnant, wrong, and illegal?

How long before we realize that what we are doing is causing emotional harm to families, especially to the children? How long before we consider how history will remember this moment and judge us?

What national security threat are we facing today that warrants such a barbaric response towards families and children? They are exactly that: children, families, babies.

They are coming to our borders pleading for help and protection. They are fleeing kidnapping, rape, murder, and threats. They are not MS-13; they are fleeing MS-13. They want to work and raise their children in peace. Is that so terrible?

This administration is deliberately choosing to inflict trauma onto thousands of children, holding children hostage, using child abuse as a scare tactic to deter families from coming here seeking refuge.

There are still more than 2,000 children separated from their families at this present moment. President Trump may have signed his executive order last week, but he failed to implement a plan to reunite these families—no plan to reunite these families.

We are doing nothing to fix this problem today. And let's be clear: Speaker RYAN's bill, which we may or may not consider this week, does nothing to fix this problem either. All his bill does is pave the way for long-term incarceration of families in prison-like facilities. It would be replacing one form of child abuse for another.

I visited some of these detention centers at our borders. The horrendous conditions we are exposing families to are completely unacceptable.

Where are we, as a nation, when we place children in cage-like cells, inside warehouses, with nothing but an emergency thermal blanket and a thin mat between them and the cold concrete floor, with a toilet in the middle of the cell? Criminally prosecuting every individual, every child, who crosses between a port of entry, who poses no threat to our country, is not only inhumane, it makes us less secure.

We have a limited number of prosecutors. We have to make choices. If you prosecute one crime, it means you are not prosecuting another. So when we send our prosecutors after every single border crosser, who benefits? Let me tell you who benefits. The murderers, the rapists, the drug traffickers, the drug dealers, the pimps, the muggers, and the human traffickers, that is who will benefit from this. We are taking away from where law enforcement agencies need the most and are wasting by traumatizing defenseless families. How does this make us safe?

This administration's impulsive zero-tolerance policy is harming our moral credibility. It is harming our national security. Most of all, it is harming innocent babies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I agree that the court determination, essentially rejecting the Korematsu decision yesterday, was the right one. And we agree that the episode in our Nation's history, in which we were holding Japanese Americans in internment camps, was a dark one and was something that should not have happened. But I think that it is unjustifiable, and I think, frankly, it just politicizes the challenge that we are all facing to compare the current situation at our borders with Japanese internment camps, or with concentration camps, or many of the other exaggerations and, I think, highly irresponsible language that we have heard throughout this debate.

We all have to come together to solve the problem, but we have to come together to enforce our laws. If, in fact, my colleagues are interested in enforcing the laws, if they are interested in solving the problem for the families at the border, and if they are interested in closing the loopholes in the law that have resulted in the separation of those children, then I assume that they will be voting in favor of Mr. GOODLATTE's bill that will be coming up for consideration today.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, it is not accurate for our colleagues to say that families seeking asylum are having their children ripped out of their arms. Anybody who is seeking asylum,

who goes to a port of entry, is not going to be subject to prosecution and will not be separated from their families.

I think it is very important for us to make clear that we are talking about people seeking to come into this country illegally, and, in many cases, as I mentioned before, we are talking about children who are being trafficked. We have to make sure, as we deal with this issue and as we come to a resolution and a solution that will help these kids, that, in fact, we do it in a way that addresses the facts.

Mr. Speaker, it is really important that we focus back on the issue that we are here to talk about today, and that is Defense Appropriations.

What we have seen this afternoon is the same thing that we seem to see every time this bill comes up. This is a really important, really good bipartisan bill, and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to talk about everything under the Sun, apparently, except Defense Appropriations.

If we don't get Defense Appropriations right, if we don't get it passed through this House and passed through the Senate and signed before September 30, we are looking at the possibility of another continuing resolution for the Defense Department.

Now, we have seen this happen before. We saw it happen last year. We watched the Democrats in the Senate, for example, shut down the government because they wanted to hold our troops hostage, because they were in a position where they wanted to do everything possible except just pass Defense Appropriations.

Tragically, Mr. Speaker, this isn't just a matter of words like "readiness," "modernization," and "capability." Those words all matter. But there are real men and women behind those words, and families behind them.

So when we are in a situation where we abrogate our duty, and we don't provide the funds that our men and women in uniform need, we end up putting the lives of our servicemen and -women on the line. I don't think that any Member of this body ever wants to be in a situation again where the Secretary of Defense, or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, or the service chiefs come in and say that we, as a body, have done more damage to the military than any enemy has in the field. That is what we have heard consistently and repeatedly over the course of the last several years.

Taking the step of passing this rule and making sure that we pass this underlying appropriations bill is a crucial part of continuing on the path of fulfilling the commitment that we made and fulfilling the commitment that the President of the United States made that he would rebuild our military.

Every man and woman in uniform, who puts the uniform on, as Secretary Mattis has said, is essentially writing a blank check to this Nation, and it is a blank check that is payable with their

lives. We ought to stop spending our time on this floor debating a whole bunch of other things. The Senate ought to stop spending its time stuck in the filibuster rule, stuck in the process of going on and on for hours and hours over matters that, frankly, don't have anywhere near the importance that funding our troops does, and they ought to move to get this bill passed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of both the rule and H.R. 6157.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. TORRES is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 964 OFFERED BY
MRS. TORRES

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

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6236) to require the reunification of families separated upon entry into the United States as a result of the "zero-tolerance" immigration policy requiring criminal prosecution of all adults apprehended crossing the border illegally. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6236.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the

opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, consideration of the bill (H.R. 6136) to amend the immigration laws and provide for border security, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ESPAILLAT. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Espallat moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6136 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 1, in the heading, strike "; TABLE OF CONTENTS".

In subsection (a) of section 1, strike the enumerator and the heading.

Strike subsection (b) of section 1 and all that follows through the end of the bill, and insert the following:

SEC. 2. PROTECTING IMMIGRANT CHILDREN FROM GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED ABUSE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, judicial determination, consent decree, or settlement agreement, no officer or employee of the United States may detain an alien who entered the United States with the alien's child who has not attained 18 years of age separately from such child for the purpose of deterring immigration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6136, the Border Security and Immigration Reform Act, has been touted as "the compromise bill." But don't let that fool you. This bill cuts legal immigration by 40 percent. This bill cancels diversity green cards. This bill eliminates most family reunification. And finally, this bill hurts asylum seekers.

This bill is anything but a compromise. It is anything but fair. And it is certainly not pro-family.

We have spent the last few days and weeks watching babies ripped away from their parents' arms. We heard their cries in the middle of the night as they missed their parents, and the American people were truly moved by this humanitarian crisis.

This crisis drew attention from international institutions and organizations, such as the United Nations, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, all of them condemning the separation of children from their families.

This Nation has a longstanding tradition of providing asylum to those who flee death, terror, and natural disasters. We need to continue to be a beacon of hope and aspiration for the rest of the world. Asylum seekers, including women who have been raped, deserve due process, not these massive arraignment hearings, which blatantly go against our democratic traditions.

Let's be honest here, last week's executive order and this morning's tweet where the President admits that this bill is about "strong borders," tells us that this is not about our families or injustice. This is about him getting \$25

billion for a wall and another \$7 billion to hold families in detention facilities. Yes, families in jail or tent cities or maybe even in military camps, similar to the Japanese internment camps used during World War II.

Children really belong in schools. They deserve to be safe with their parents, not to be jailed in cages that look like kennels. Babies as young as 9 months old are being held in my district, in East Harlem, away from their moms.

If Republicans are serious about families, we should pass this motion to recommit and the Keep the Families Together Act. This act is simple. It would protect immigrant children from government-sponsored abuse, and it would keep us in compliance with the Flores decree—yes, a court decree. This decree disallows children to be held for more than 20 days.

It also is in line with yesterday's preliminary injunction, which requires that children younger than 5 years old be returned to their parents within 14 days and older children be returned within 30 days.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, show some basic compassion for these young children, their brothers and sisters, and their parents. Every single Member of Congress should be able to stand behind the simple idea that families, regardless of where they come from, belong together. The separation of children from their families constitutes child abuse.

Mr. Speaker, we need to finally ask ourselves: will we continue to be a country of aspirations or will we continue to be a country of deportation? Will we step up to be the country that allowed me, as a young boy, to find safety next to my mother and father?

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this effort to distract us from the major problems that we are attempting to address in our country. This motion to recommit deals only with a red herring. It fixes nothing, but rather ensures that catch and release will remain in effect.

The American people want a holistic approach to reforming immigration laws that focuses on enforcement first before legalization. The motion to recommit simply does not do that.

H.R. 6136 helps solve the problem with a surge of people coming illegally into the United States by funding the border wall construction and other infrastructure at the border, and it closes the loopholes that require catch and release of aliens who have entered illegally. The bill begins the process of reforming the way U.S. green cards are

allocated. And it provides a path to legalization for the DACA-eligible population.

H.R. 6136 addresses the areas that need to be addressed in immigration: enforcement, including a true fix to the issue of separation of children from their parents; it includes border security, legal immigration, and legalization for DACA-eligible individuals.

The motion to recommit does none of that. I urge my colleagues to oppose that motion.

I also want to call to everyone's attention the Statement of Administration Policy issued by the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget just this morning. It says in part: "The administration strongly supports House passage of H.R. 6136, the Border Security and Immigration Reform Act of 2018. . . ."

"H.R. 6136 would end the visa lottery program and would begin moving toward a merit-based system for admission. H.R. 6136 would also reduce extended-family chain migration by removing family preference categories for siblings and adult married children. . . ."

"Overall, the Border Security and Immigration Reform Act of 2018 would support the administration's goals of securing the border, closing legal loopholes, moving to a system of merit-based immigration, and providing a responsible solution to DACA.

"If H.R. 6136 were presented to the President, his advisers would recommend that he sign it into law."

But, you don't have to listen to his advisers. You can listen to the President himself, because he tweeted this morning: "House Republicans should pass the strong but fair immigration bill, known as Goodlatte II, in their afternoon vote today, even though the Dems won't let it pass in the Senate. Passage will show that we want strong borders and security while the Dems want open borders equals crime. Win."

That is what we need to do today. We need to win by defeating this motion to recommit and passing this important legislation that brings America forward in addressing our immigration issues, is an appropriate fix for the DACA population, secures our borders, and moves towards a merit-based immigration system that this country needs. That is what we are about today.

Mr. Speaker, reject the motion to recommit, pass this bill.

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 ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

Passage of H.R. 6136, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 964; and

Adoption of House Resolution 964, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 230, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

AYES—190

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

NOES—230

Abraham	Barton	Brooks (IN)
Aderholt	Bergman	Buchanan
Allen	Biggs	Buck
Amash	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Amodei	Bishop (MI)	Budd
Arrington	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Babin	Blackburn	Byrne
Bacon	Bost	Calvert
Banks (IN)	Brady (TX)	Carter (GA)
Barletta	Brat	Chabot
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Cheney

Coffman	Issa	Renacci
Cole	Jenkins (KS)	Rice (SC)
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Roby
Collins (NY)	Johnson (LA)	Roe (TN)
Comer	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Comstock	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	Jones	Rohrabacher
Cook	Jordan	Rokita
Costello (PA)	Joyce (OH)	Rooney, Francis
Cramer	Katko	Rooney, Thomas J.
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Culberson	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Curbelo (FL)	King (IA)	Ross
Curtis	King (NY)	Rothfus
Davidson	Kinzing	Rouzer
Davis, Rodney	Knight	Royce (CA)
Denham	Kustoff (TN)	Russell
DeSantis	Labrador	Rutherford
DesJarlais	LaHood	Sanford
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Scalise
Donovan	Lamborn	Schweikert
Duffy	Lance	Scott, Austin
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (TN)	Lesko	Sessions
Dunn	Lewis (MN)	Shimkus
Emmer	LoBiondo	Shuster
Estes (KS)	Long	Simpson
Faso	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
Ferguson	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Fleischmann	MacArthur	Smith (TX)
Flores	Marchant	Smucker
Fortenberry	Marino	Stefanik
Fox	Marshall	Stewart
Frelinghuysen	Massie	Stivers
Gaetz	Mast	Taylor
Gallagher	McCarthy	Tenney
Garrett	McCauley	Thompson (PA)
Gianforte	McClintock	Thornberry
Gibbs	McHenry	Tipton
Gohmert	McKinley	Trott
Goodlatte	McMorris	Turner
Gosar	Rodgers	Upton
Gowdy	McSally	Valadao
Granger	Meadows	Wagner
Graves (GA)	Mitchell	Walberg
Graves (LA)	Moolenaar	Walden
Graves (MO)	Mooney (WV)	Walker
Griffith	Mullin	Walorski
Grothman	Guthrie	Walters, Mimi
Handel	Neom	Weber (TX)
Harper	Norman	Webster (FL)
Harris	Nunes	Wenstrup
Hartzer	Olson	Westerman
Hensarling	Palazzo	Williams
Herrera Beutler	Palmer	Wilson (SC)
Hice, Jody B.	Paulsen	Wittman
Higgins (LA)	Pearce	Womack
Hill	Perry	Woodall
Holding	Pittenger	Yoder
Hollingsworth	Poe (TX)	Yoho
Hudson	Poliquin	Young (AK)
Huizenga	Posey	Young (IA)
Hultgren	Ratcliffe	Zeldin
Hunter	Reed	
Hurd	Reichert	

NOT VOTING—7

Black	DeGette	Thompson (MS)
Carter (TX)	Messer	
Crowley	Rush	

□ 1343

Messrs. BACON, COMER, YOUNG of Alaska, PITTENGER, BURGESS, and JORDAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. BASS, Messrs. BISHOP of Georgia, POCAN, BEYER, SUOZZI, COOPER, PAYNE, and KEATING changed their 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. NADLER. 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 121, noes 301, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

AYES—121

Amodei	Harper	Poliquin
Bacon	Hartzler	Reed
Barr	Hensarling	Reichert
Barton	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Bergman	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Bilirakis	Hill	Rooney, Francis
Bishop (MI)	Huizenga	Rooney, Thomas
Bishop (UT)	Hultgren	J.
Bost	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Roskam
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Bucshon	Joyce (OH)	Royce (CA)
Calvert	Katko	Rutherford
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Coffman	King (NY)	Scalise
Cole	Kinzinger	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Knight	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lance	Shuster
Comstock	Lewis (MN)	Simpson
Conaway	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Costello (PA)	Love	Stefanik
Cramer	Lucas	Stewart
Curbelo (FL)	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Curtis	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Marino	Thornberry
Denham	Marshall	Trott
Diaz-Balart	Mast	Turner
Donovan	McCarthy	Upton
Duffy	McCaul	Valadao
Dunn	McHenry	Wagner
Faso	McKinley	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Walden
Flores	Rodgers	Walorski
Fortenberry	McSally	Walters, Mimi
Frelinghuysen	Mitchell	Webster
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Newhouse	Womack
Goodlatte	Nunes	Woodall
Griffith	Paulsen	Yoder
Guthrie	Pearce	Young (AK)
Handel	Pittenger	Young (IA)

NOES—301

Abraham	Cheney	Esty (CT)
Adams	Chu, Judy	Evans
Aderholt	Cicilline	Ferguson
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	Fleischmann
Allen	Clarke (NY)	Foster
Amash	Clay	Fox
Arrington	Cleaver	Frankel (FL)
Babin	Clyburn	Fudge
Banks (IN)	Cohen	Gabbard
Barletta	Comer	Gaetz
Barragán	Connolly	Gallagher
Bass	Cook	Galleo
Beatty	Cooper	Garamendi
Bera	Correa	Garrett
Beyer	Costa	Gohmert
Biggs	Courtney	Gomez
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Gonzalez (TX)
Blackburn	Crist	Gosar
Blum	Cuellar	Gottheimer
Blumenauer	Culberson	Gowdy
Blunt Rochester	Cummings	Granger
Bonamici	Davidson	Graves (GA)
Boyle, Brendan	Davis (CA)	Graves (LA)
F.	Davis, Danny	Graves (MO)
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Green, Al
Brat	Delaney	Green, Gene
Brooks (AL)	DeLauro	Grijalva
Brown (MD)	DelBene	Grothman
Brownley (CA)	Demings	Gutiérrez
Buchanan	DeSantis	Hanabusa
Buck	DeSaulnier	Harris
Budd	DesJarlais	Hastings
Burgess	Deutch	Heck
Bustos	Dingell	Hice, Jody B.
Butterfield	Doggett	Higgins (NY)
Byrne	Doyle, Michael	Himes
Capuano	F.	Holding
Carbajal	Duncan (SC)	Hollingsworth
Cárdenas	Duncan (TN)	Hoyer
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Hudson
Carter (GA)	Emmer	Huffman
Carter (TX)	Engel	Hunter
Cartwright	Eshoo	Hurd
Castor (FL)	Españat	Jackson Lee
Castro (TX)	Estes (KS)	Jayapal

Jeffries	McEachin	Sánchez
Jenkins (WV)	McGovern	Sanford
Johnson (GA)	McNerney	Sarbanes
Johnson (LA)	Meadows	Schakowsky
Johnson, E. B.	Meeks	Schiff
Johnson, Sam	Meng	Schneider
Jones	Mooney (WV)	Schrader
Jordan	Moore	Schweikert
Kaptur	Moulton	Scott (VA)
Keating	Mullin	Scott, David
Kelly (IL)	Murphy (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Kelly (MS)	Nadler	Serrano
Kennedy	Napolitano	Sessions
Khan	Neal	Sewell (AL)
Kihuen	Noem	Shea-Porter
Kildee	Nolan	Sherman
Kilmer	Norcross	Sinema
Kind	Norman	Sires
King (IA)	O'Halleran	Smith (MO)
Krishnamoorthi	O'Rourke	Smith (NE)
Kuster (NH)	Olson	Smith (TX)
Kustoff (TN)	Palazzo	Smith (WA)
Labrador	Pallone	Smucker
LaHood	Palmer	Soto
LaMalfa	Panetta	Speier
Lamb	Passcrell	Suozzi
Lamborn	Payne	Syalwell (CA)
Langevin	Pelosi	Takano
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Taylor
Larson (CT)	Perry	Tenney
Latta	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Lawrence	Peterson	Tipton
Lawson (FL)	Pingree	Titus
Lee	Pocan	Tonko
Lesko	Poe (TX)	Torres
Levin	Polis	Tsongas
Lewis (GA)	Posey	Vargas
Lieu, Ted	Price (NC)	Veasey
Lipinski	Quigley	Vela
Loeb	Raskin	Velázquez
Loeb	Ratcliffe	Visclosky
Lofgren	Rice (NY)	Walker
Long	Rice (SC)	Walz
Loudermilk	Richmond	Wasserman
Lowenthal	Roby	Schultz
Lowe	Roe (TN)	Waters, Maxine
Lujan Grisham,	Rogers (AL)	Watson Coleman
M.	Rohrabacher	Weber (TX)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rokita	Webster (FL)
Lynch	Rosen	Welch
Maloney,	Rothfus	Westerman
Carolyn B.	Rouzer	Williams
Maloney, Sean	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)
Marchant	Ruiz	Wittman
Massie	Ruppersberger	Yarmuth
Matsui	Russell	Yoho
McClintock	Ryan (OH)	Zeldin
McCollum		

NOT VOTING—6

Black	DeGette	Rush
Crowley	Messer	Thompson (MS)

□ 1350

So the bill was not passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6157, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JUNE 29, 2018, THROUGH JULY 9, 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 964) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from June 9, 2018, through July 9, 2018, on which a recorded vote was ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

RECORDED VOTE

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 188, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

AYES—231

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

NOES—188

Adams	Beyer	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	F.
Barragán	Blumenauer	Brady (PA)
Bass	Blunt Rochester	Brown (MD)
Beatty	Bonamici	Brownley (CA)
Bera		Bustos

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN SPACE TECHNOLOGY AND ADVANCED ROCKETRY ACT

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5345) to designate the Marshall Space Flight Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to provide leadership for the U.S. rocket propulsion industrial base, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5345

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 “American Leadership in Space Technology and Advanced Rocketry Act” or the “ALSTAR Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Non-military rocket propulsion is an enabling technology for our Nation’s future prosperous way of life.

(2) Non-military rocket propulsion technologies are critical to national security, intelligence gathering, communications, weather forecasting, navigation, communications, entertainment, land use, Earth observation, and scientific exploration.

(3) The non-military rocket propulsion industry is a source of high-quality jobs.

(4) Multiple Federal agencies and companies are involved in non-military rocket propulsion research, development, and manufacturing.

(5) Integration, coordination, and cooperation would strengthen the United States non-military rocket propulsion industrial base.

(6) Erosion of the non-military rocket propulsion industrial base would seriously impact national security, space exploration potential, and economic growth.

(7) The Marshall Space Flight Center has decades of experience working with other Government agencies and industry partners to study and coordinate these capabilities.

(8) The Marshall Space Flight Center has made historic and unique contributions—

(A) by bringing stakeholders together to work on non-military rocket propulsion industrial base sustainment;

(B) of technical expertise to key studies and review boards; and

(C) by consistently participating in interagency working groups to address non-military rocket propulsion issues.

SEC. 3. NON-MILITARY ROCKET PROPULSION LEADERSHIP.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Marshall Space Flight Center is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s lead center for non-military rocket propulsion and is essential to sustaining and promoting U.S. leadership in non-military rocket propulsion and developing the next generation of non-military rocket propulsion capabilities.

(b) LEADERSHIP IN NON-MILITARY ROCKET PROPULSION.—The Marshall Space Flight Center shall provide national leadership in NASA in non-military rocket propulsion by—

(1) contributing to interagency coordination for the preservation of critical national non-military rocket propulsion capabilities;

(2) collaborating with industry, academia, and professional organizations to most effectively use national capabilities and resources;

(3) monitoring public- and private-sector non-military rocket propulsion activities to develop and promote a strong, healthy non-military rocket propulsion industrial base;

(4) facilitating technical solutions for existing and emerging non-military rocket propulsion challenges;

(5) supporting the development and refinement of non-military rocket propulsion for small satellites;

(6) evaluating and recommending, as appropriate, new non-military rocket propulsion technologies for further development; and

(7) providing information required by national decisionmakers so that policies and other instruments of the Government support the development and strengthening of the Nation’s non-military rocket propulsion capabilities throughout the 21st century.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5345, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the Congressman for the Tennessee Valley of the State of Alabama, I am uniquely situated to appreciate the valuable contribution the Marshall Space Flight Center has made and continues to make to America’s rocket propulsion capabilities.

As a child growing up in Huntsville, Alabama, I well remember the 1960s as nearby Saturn V rocket engine tests shook the ground and rattled the windows. I also remember the great pride in America I felt the moment Neil Armstrong stepped on the Moon after leaving the Earth on one of our Saturn V rockets.

No doubt about it, developing and improving rocket propulsion is essential to America’s leadership in space exploration and national security.

It has been the Marshall Space Flight Center that has provided and continues to provide the cutting-edge expertise America needs in both solid and liquid rocket propulsion.

□ 1415

Over the last several years, Americans have witnessed a resurgence in the rocket propulsion industry. As traditional and emerging actors move forward, it is important that the Federal Government minimize expensive duplication and support healthy cooperation and communication between the private sector and the Federal Government to promote America’s robust rocket propulsion industry.

With President Trump’s establishment of Space Force as an independent

branch of the military, rocket propulsion is recognized as even more important to securing America’s future than ever before because America’s military relies heavily on its space assets—global positioning satellites being but one example—to protect our national security.

As Congress guides America’s national space policy, we must promote the robust rocket propulsion industrial base that is essential to our space presence.

My bill, H.R. 5345, the American Leadership in Space Technology and Advanced Rocketry Act of 2018, commonly known as the ALSTAR Act, helps ensure the long-term stability of the rocket propulsion industry through better coordination and collaboration between all relevant stakeholders, public and private.

Specifically, the ALSTAR Act formally designates Marshall Space Flight Center as NASA’s current and future lead center for rocket propulsion.

In addition, the ALSTAR Act directs Marshall to explore, develop, and mature new rocket propulsion technology in cooperation with partners across and outside of government. This new emphasis, while building on a strong foundation, helps to ensure that America remains at the forefront of space exploration.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1940s and 1950s, voyages to the Moon were thought impossible, but America rose to the challenge and overcame the impossible. Today, America must, once again, challenge itself to reach far beyond its limits.

Through our increased attention, focus, and support of utilization of space and the exploration of deep space, we too can overcome the impossible and help inspire the next generation of Americans to look to the stars and go where no one has gone before.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I support a robust and innovative space industry. I also believe that it is very important that we leverage the investment taxpayers have allowed the Nation to make in its facilities and workforce.

The bill before us today that is known as H.R. 5345, also known as the American Leadership in Space Technology and Advanced Rocketry Act, recognizes the rocket propulsion work of the Marshall Space Flight Center and that center’s role in helping to develop the next generation of rocket propulsion capabilities. The Marshall Space Flight Center has a long and storied history in rocket development dating back to the huge Saturn V rockets that powered our astronauts to the Moon. That tradition continues to this day.

Mr. Speaker, I support moving this bill out of the House floor, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the vice chairman of the Space Subcommittee for yielding me time, and I appreciate all that Mr. BROOKS, the gentleman from Alabama, has done for space exploration and for spaceflight.

The House Science, Space, and Technology Committee has demonstrated time and again that U.S. leadership in space is a bipartisan priority. The scientists, engineers, and technicians at the Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Alabama, have, for more than half a century, led the world in the development of rocket propulsion.

H.R. 5345, the American Leadership in Space Technology and Advanced Rocketry Act, recognizes the impressive accomplishments of Marshall as well as vital, ongoing work they continue to do to ensure continued American leadership in space technology and rocketry capabilities.

As our future in space looks bolder, bigger, and brighter, I am confident that Marshall will continue to be a reliable, powerful, and dependable team player in moving this Nation forward.

Mr. Speaker, Vice Chairman BROOKS has always been a strong and effective advocate for space initiatives and Marshall Space Flight Center. I appreciate all he has done on the subject, and I very much appreciate his being such a leader on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and it is a privilege to work with Representative MO BROOKS on the Space Subcommittee advancing our Nation's priorities and doing our part to ensure strong leadership in America's space program.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for this important bill. He is a true champion of Marshall Space Flight Center, the center's employees, and the important work they do every day to keep America first in space.

The excitement and enthusiasm about our Government and private space activities have been building toward a fever pitch. The fine scientists, engineers, and technicians at Marshall Space Flight Center have for more than half a century led the world in the development of rocket propulsion.

This bill recognizes the impressive accomplishments of Marshall as well as the vital, ongoing work they continue to do to ensure continued American leadership in space.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to have worked on and cosponsored this legislation with my colleague, Mr. BROOKS. As our future in space looks bolder and brighter, I am confident that the Marshall Space Flight Center will continue to be a reliable, powerful, and dependable team player moving this Nation forward.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5345, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMERCIAL SPACE SUPPORT VEHICLE ACT

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5346) to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for licenses and experimental permits for space support vehicles, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5346

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 "Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 50902 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (21) through (25) as paragraphs (23) through (27), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (20) the following:

"(21) 'space support flight' means a flight in the air that is—

"(A) not a launch or reentry; but

"(B) related to launch or reentry services.

"(22) 'space support vehicle' means a vehicle that is—

"(A) a launch vehicle;

"(B) a reentry vehicle; or

"(C) a component of a launch or reentry vehicle."

SEC. 3. LICENSING OF SPACE SUPPORT FLIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 50904 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) SPACE SUPPORT FLIGHTS.—

"(1) The Secretary of Transportation may issue or transfer a license for multiple space support flights of a space support vehicle to a citizen of the United States, but only if such citizen holds an operator license issued under this chapter for launch or reentry of such space support vehicle as, or included as a component of, a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle.

"(2) A licensee may only carry out a space support flight of a space support vehicle under a license for carrying a person or property for compensation or hire if such flight lands at the same site from which the vehicle took flight."

(b) LIMITATION ON WAIVER OF REQUIREMENTS.—Section 50905(b)(3) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by inserting ", or the operation of a space support vehicle," after "or a reentry vehicle".

SEC. 4. EXPERIMENTAL PERMITS FOR SPACE SUPPORT FLIGHTS.

Section 50906 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

"(d) The Secretary may issue a permit only for—

"(1) reusable suborbital rockets or reusable launch vehicles that will be launched into a suborbital trajectory or reentered under that permit solely for—

"(A) research and development to test design concepts, equipment, or operating techniques;

"(B) showing compliance with requirements as part of the process for obtaining a license for launch or reentry under this chapter; or

"(C) crew training for a launch or reentry using the design of the rocket or vehicle for which the permit would be issued; or

"(2) a space support vehicle, or a vehicle that is in development to become a space support vehicle, operated by a citizen of the United States for space support flights that will be conducted under the permit for, or in support of, the purposes described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1)."; and

(2) by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

"(h) No person may, under a permit, operate a reusable suborbital rocket, reusable launch vehicle, or space support vehicle for carrying any property or human being for compensation or hire."

SEC. 5. COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPARENCY.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to discuss potential regulatory approaches, potential performance standards, or any other topic related to this Act and the amendments made by this Act with the commercial space industry prior to the issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking.

SEC. 6. APPLICABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on March 1, 2019.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Transportation may issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out the amendments made by this Act beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5346, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5346, the Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act, was largely developed with input from a Department of Transportation report on approaches for streamlining the licensing and permitting of hybrid launch vehicles to enable non-launch flight operations. Hybrid launch vehicles are those that have some of the

characteristics of aircraft and some of the characteristics of launch vehicles.

Companies would like to utilize space support vehicles to train crews and spaceflight participants by exposing them to the physiological effects encountered in spaceflight or conduct research in reduced gravity environments. Spaceports, like those in Florida and other States, would like to attract those companies to operate out of their facilities.

The DOT report concluded that: “The option of having a single statutory regime and regulatory office oversee a demonstrated commercial space program throughout its operational life cycle would allow consistent application of regulatory philosophy and safety oversight and be more efficient and cost effective for the launch operator as well as the licensing agency. For an evolving industry, a regulatory environment that can adjust to accommodate changes would allow for more flexible and more responsive oversight.”

Additionally, a GAO report issued last year recommended that the FAA examine the FAA’s current regulatory framework for space support vehicles and suggest legislative or regulatory changes as applicable.

I believe H.R. 5346 provides the appropriate regulatory approach by authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to develop the regulations by March 1, 2019, allowing licensed space support flights. The intent of timing is to include the development of regulations in the regulatory reform process that the Vice President and the National Space Council tasked the FAA to complete by that date.

Of course, I want to thank my friend of many, many decades, Congressman LAWSON from the great State of Florida, for his cosponsorship and support of this bill, as well as Chairman LAMAR SMITH and Subcommittee Chairman BRIAN BABIN, both of Texas, for advancing and cosponsoring this great piece of legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support a robust and successful commercial space industry. In that regard, I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on policies that facilitate the Nation’s continued growth and leadership in space.

The bill before us today, H.R. 5346, known as the Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act, will amend the statute to provide the Secretary of Transportation with authority to license or permit space support vehicles for space support flights such as crew training or research and development that are related to space launch or reentry.

While I am not aware of any pressing need for this amendment at this time, it may provide the industry with some additional flexibility.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it is very important to point out, too, that the

FAA’s Office of Commercial Space Transportation is sufficiently resourced to accommodate any additional work so that the office can continue to focus on its core responsibilities of licensing and permitting commercial space launch and reentry vehicles.

Mr. Speaker, I support moving the bill out of the House, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the longtime efforts of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) to advance space initiatives. His efforts are reflected in H.R. 5346, the Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act, which he authored and brings to the floor today.

Maintaining and expanding America’s leadership in human space activity, especially in the commercial space sector, is a priority of mine and of paramount importance to Mr. POSEY and the members on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

The Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act was developed with input from the Department of Transportation as a new and better approach to streamline the licensing and permitting process of hybrid launch vehicles.

Private companies would like to use space support vehicles to train crews and spaceflight participants by exposing them to the physiological effects and reduced gravity environment encountered in spaceflight, and many spaceports would like to encourage those companies to operate out of their facilities.

H.R. 5346 provides the fairest, most appropriate regulatory approach by authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to develop regulations, according to the requirements of the bill, by March 1, 2019, thereby enabling licensed space support flights.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank Mr. POSEY who is always a leader on space issues for taking the initiative on this bill.

□ 1430

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. BILL POSEY, for his tireless efforts in drafting the Commercial Space Support Vehicle Act and his leadership in the Space Subcommittee in moving this bill to the House floor today. He has always been and continues to be one of the leading champions in Congress for American leadership in space. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill.

Simply said, this bill will create jobs and economic growth in the Nation’s commercial spaceports, and it will streamline licensing requirements so that our innovators in the hybrid launch vehicle market can train future

space flight crews and participants. These innovators are at the forefront of providing aerial platforms for very important microgravity research.

GAO recommended in its report that the FAA examine the FAA’s current regulatory framework for space support vehicles and suggest legislative or regulatory changes as applicable. I believe H.R. 5346 provides the appropriate regulatory approach by authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to develop the regulations by March 1, 2019, which will allow licensed space support flights.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I once again want to thank the cosponsors on both sides of the aisle. This has been about a 9-year journey to make this much-needed change to our laws.

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5346.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SCIENCE AND INNOVATION ACT OF 2018

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5905) to authorize basic research programs in the Department of Energy Office of Science for fiscal years 2018 and 2019, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5905

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 “Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Definitions.
- Sec. 3. Mission.
- Sec. 4. Basic energy sciences.
- Sec. 5. Advanced scientific computing research.
- Sec. 6. High energy physics.
- Sec. 7. Biological and environmental research.
- Sec. 8. Fusion energy.
- Sec. 9. Nuclear physics.
- Sec. 10. Science laboratories infrastructure program.
- Sec. 11. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term “Department” means the Department of Energy.

(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Science of the Department.

(3) **NATIONAL LABORATORY.**—The term “National Laboratory” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. MISSION.

Section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **MISSION.**—The mission of the Office of Science shall be the delivery of scientific discoveries, capabilities, and major scientific tools to transform the understanding of nature and to advance the energy, economic, and national security of the United States.”.

SEC. 4. BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES.

(a) **PROGRAM.**—The Director shall carry out a program in basic energy sciences, including materials sciences and engineering, chemical sciences, physical biosciences, and geosciences, for the purpose of providing the scientific foundations for new energy technologies.

(b) **MISSION.**—The mission of the program described in subsection (a) shall be to support fundamental research to understand, predict, and ultimately control matter and energy at the electronic, atomic, and molecular levels in order to provide the foundations for new energy technologies and to support Department missions in energy, environment, and national security.

(c) **BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES USER FACILITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall carry out a program for the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of national user facilities.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the national user facilities developed, constructed, operated, or maintained under paragraph (1) shall serve the needs of the Department, industry, the academic community, and other relevant entities to create and examine materials and chemical processes for the purpose of improving the competitiveness of the United States.

(3) **INCLUDED FACILITIES.**—The national user facilities developed, constructed, operated, or maintained under paragraph (1) shall include—

- (A) x-ray light sources;
- (B) neutron sources;
- (C) nanoscale science research centers; and
- (D) such other facilities as the Director considers appropriate, consistent with section 209 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139).

(d) **BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE.**—

(1) **ADVANCED PHOTON SOURCE UPGRADE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide for the upgrade to the Advanced Photon Source described in the publication approved by the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee on June 9, 2016, titled “Report on Facility Upgrades”, including the development of a multi-bend achromat lattice to produce a high flux of coherent x-rays within the hard x-ray energy region and a suite of beamlines optimized for this source.

(B) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph:

(i) **FLUX.**—The term “flux” means the rate of flow of photons.

(ii) **HARD X-RAY.**—The term “hard x-ray” means a photon with energy greater than 20 kiloelectron volts.

(C) **START OF OPERATIONS.**—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the upgrade under this paragraph occurs before December 31, 2025.

(D) **FUNDING.**—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for Basic Energy Sciences, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out the upgrade under this paragraph—

(i) \$93,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

(ii) \$130,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(2) **SPALLATION NEUTRON SOURCE PROTON POWER UPGRADE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide for a proton power upgrade to the Spallation Neutron Source.

(B) **DEFINITION OF PROTON POWER UPGRADE.**—For the purposes of this paragraph, the term “proton power upgrade” means the Spallation Neutron Source power upgrade described in—

(i) the publication of the Office of Science of the Department of Energy titled “Facilities for the Future of Science: A Twenty-Year Outlook”, published December 2003;

(ii) the publication of the Office of Science of the Department of Energy titled “Four Years Later: An Interim Report on Facilities for the Future of Science: A Twenty-Year Outlook”, published August 2007; and

(iii) the publication approved by the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee on June 9, 2016, titled “Report on Facility Upgrades”.

(C) **START OF OPERATIONS.**—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the upgrade under this paragraph occurs before December 31, 2025.

(D) **FUNDING.**—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for Basic Energy Sciences, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out the upgrade under this paragraph—

(i) \$36,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

(ii) \$60,800,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(3) **SPALLATION NEUTRON SOURCE SECOND TARGET STATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide for a second target station for the Spallation Neutron Source.

(B) **DEFINITION OF SECOND TARGET STATION.**—For the purposes of this paragraph, the term “second target station” means the Spallation Neutron Source second target station described in—

(i) the publication of the Office of Science of the Department of Energy titled “Facilities for the Future of Science: A Twenty-Year Outlook”, published December 2003;

(ii) the publication of the Office of Science of the Department of Energy titled “Four Years Later: An Interim Report on Facilities for the Future of Science: A Twenty-Year Outlook”, published August 2007; and

(iii) the publication approved by the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee on June 9, 2016, titled “Report on Facility Upgrades”.

(C) **START OF OPERATIONS.**—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the second target station under this paragraph occurs before December 31, 2030, with the option for early operation in 2028.

(D) **FUNDING.**—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for Basic Energy Sciences, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out activities, including construction, under this paragraph—

(i) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

(ii) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(4) **ADVANCED LIGHT SOURCE UPGRADE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide for the upgrade to the Advanced Light Source described in the publication approved by the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee on June 9, 2016, titled “Report on Facility Upgrades”, including the development of a multi-bend achromat lattice to produce

a high flux of coherent x-rays within the soft x-ray energy region.

(B) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph:

(i) **FLUX.**—The term “flux” means the rate of flow of photons.

(ii) **SOFT X-RAY.**—The term “soft x-ray” means a photon with energy in the range from 50 to 2,000 electron volts.

(C) **START OF OPERATIONS.**—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the upgrade under this paragraph occurs before December 31, 2026.

(D) **FUNDING.**—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for Basic Energy Sciences, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out the upgrade under this paragraph—

(i) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

(ii) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(5) **LINAC COHERENT LIGHT SOURCE II HIGH ENERGY UPGRADE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide for the upgrade to the Linac Coherent Light Source II facility described in the publication approved by the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee on June 9, 2016, titled “Report on Facility Upgrades”, including the development of experimental capabilities for high energy x-rays to reveal fundamental scientific discoveries. The Secretary shall ensure the upgrade under this paragraph enables the production and use of high energy, ultra-short pulse x-rays delivered at a high repetition rate.

(B) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph:

(i) **HIGH ENERGY X-RAY.**—The term a “high energy x-ray” means a photon with an energy at or exceeding 12 kiloelectron volts.

(ii) **HIGH REPETITION RATE.**—The term “high repetition rate” means the delivery of x-ray pulses up to one million pulses per second.

(iii) **ULTRA-SHORT PULSE X-RAYS.**—The term “ultra-short pulse x-rays” means x-ray bursts capable of durations of less than one hundred femtoseconds.

(C) **START OF OPERATIONS.**—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the upgrade under this paragraph occurs before December 31, 2025.

(D) **FUNDING.**—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for Basic Energy Sciences, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out the upgrade under this paragraph—

(i) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

(ii) \$55,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(e) **ACCELERATOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—The Director shall carry out research and development on advanced accelerator and storage ring technologies relevant to the development of Basic Energy Sciences user facilities, in consultation with the Office of Science’s High Energy Physics and Nuclear Physics programs.

(f) **SOLAR FUELS RESEARCH INITIATIVE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 973 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16313) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 973. SOLAR FUELS RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

“(a) **INITIATIVE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out a research initiative, to be known as the ‘Solar Fuels Research Initiative’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Initiative’) to expand theoretical and fundamental knowledge of photochemistry, electrochemistry, biochemistry, and materials science useful for the practical development of experimental systems to convert solar energy to chemical energy.

“(2) **LEVERAGING.**—In carrying out programs and activities under the Initiative, the Secretary shall leverage expertise and resources from—

“(A) the Basic Energy Sciences Program and the Biological and Environmental Research Program of the Office of Science; and
 “(B) the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

“(3) TEAMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary shall organize activities among multidisciplinary teams to leverage, to the maximum extent practicable, expertise from the National Laboratories, institutions of higher education, and the private sector.

“(B) GOALS.—The multidisciplinary teams described in subparagraph (A) shall pursue aggressive, milestone-driven, basic research goals.

“(C) RESOURCES.—The Secretary shall provide sufficient resources to the multidisciplinary teams described in subparagraph (A) to achieve the goals described in subparagraph (B) over a period of time to be determined by the Secretary.

“(4) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may organize additional activities under this subsection through Energy Frontier Research Centers, Energy Innovation Hubs, or other organizational structures.

“(b) ARTIFICIAL PHOTOSYNTHESIS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research needed to bridge scientific barriers to, and discover knowledge relevant to, artificial photosynthetic systems.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences shall support basic research to pursue distinct lines of scientific inquiry, including—

“(i) photoinduced production of hydrogen and oxygen from water; and

“(ii) the sustainable photoinduced reduction of carbon dioxide to fuel products including hydrocarbons, alcohols, carbon monoxide, and natural gas; and

“(B) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Basic Energy Sciences, the Secretary shall make available for carrying out activities under this subsection \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2019.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.

“(c) BIOCHEMISTRY, REPLICATION OF NATURAL PHOTOSYNTHESIS, AND RELATED PROCESSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research needed to replicate natural photosynthetic processes by use of artificial photosynthetic components and materials.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences shall support basic research to expand fundamental knowledge to replicate natural synthesis processes, including—

“(i) the photoinduced reduction of dinitrogen to ammonia; and

“(ii) the absorption of carbon dioxide from ambient air;

“(iii) molecular-based charge separation and storage;

“(iv) photoinitiated electron transfer; and

“(v) catalysis in biological or biomimetic systems;

“(B) the Associate Director of Biological and Environmental Research shall support systems biology and genomics approaches to understand genetic and physiological pathways connected to photosynthetic mechanisms; and

“(C) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Basic Energy Sciences and Biological and Environmental Research, the Secretary shall make available for carrying out activities under this subsection \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2019.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended by striking the item relating to section 973 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 973. Solar fuels research initiative.”.

(g) ELECTRICITY STORAGE RESEARCH INITIATIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 975 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16315) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 975. ELECTRICITY STORAGE RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

“(a) INITIATIVE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a research initiative, to be known as the ‘Electricity Storage Research Initiative’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Initiative’)—

“(A) to expand theoretical and fundamental knowledge to control, store, and convert—

“(i) electrical energy to chemical energy; and

“(ii) chemical energy to electrical energy; and

“(B) to support scientific inquiry into the practical understanding of chemical and physical processes that occur within systems involving crystalline and amorphous solids, polymers, and organic and aqueous liquids.

“(2) LEVERAGING.—In carrying out programs and activities under the Initiative, the Secretary shall leverage expertise and resources from—

“(A) the Basic Energy Sciences Program, the Advanced Scientific Computing Research Program, and the Biological and Environmental Research Program of the Office of Science; and

“(B) the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

“(3) TEAMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary shall organize activities among multidisciplinary teams to leverage, to the maximum extent practicable, expertise from the National Laboratories, institutions of higher education, and the private sector.

“(B) GOALS.—The multidisciplinary teams described in subparagraph (A) shall pursue aggressive, milestone-driven, basic research goals.

“(C) RESOURCES.—The Secretary shall provide sufficient resources to the multidisciplinary teams described in subparagraph (A) to achieve the goals described in subparagraph (B) over a period of time to be determined by the Secretary.

“(4) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may organize additional activities under this subsection through Energy Frontier Research Centers, Energy Innovation Hubs, or other organizational structures.

“(b) MULTIVALENT SYSTEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research needed to bridge scientific barriers to, and discover knowledge relevant to, multivalent ion materials in electric energy storage systems.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences shall investigate electrochemical properties and the dynamics of materials, including charge transfer phenomena and mass transport in materials; and

“(B) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Basic Energy Sciences and Biological and Environmental Research, the Secretary shall make available for carrying out activities under this subsection \$50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2019.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.

“(c) ELECTROCHEMISTRY MODELING AND SIMULATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research to model and simulate organic electrolytes, including the static and dynamic electrochemical behavior and phenomena of organic electrolytes at the molecular and atomic level in monovalent and multivalent systems.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences, in coordination with the Associate Director of Advanced Scientific Computing Research, shall support the development of high performance computational tools through a joint development process to maximize the effectiveness of current and projected high performance computing systems; and

“(B) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Basic Energy Sciences and Advanced Scientific Computing Research, the Secretary shall make available for carrying out activities under this

subsection \$30,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2019.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.

“(d) MESOSCALE ELECTROCHEMISTRY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out under the Initiative a program to support research needed to reveal electrochemistry in confined mesoscale spaces, including scientific discoveries relevant to—

“(A) bio-electrochemistry and electrochemical energy conversion and storage in confined spaces; and

“(B) the dynamics of the phenomena described in subparagraph (A).

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) the Director of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences and the Associate Director of Biological and Environmental Research shall investigate phenomena of mesoscale electrochemical confinement for the purpose of replicating and controlling new electrochemical behavior; and

“(B) the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy shall support translational research, development, and validation of physical concepts developed under the program.

“(3) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review activities carried out under the program described in paragraph (1) to determine the achievement of technical milestones.

“(4) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Basic Energy Sciences and Biological and Environmental Research, the Secretary shall make available for carrying out activities under this subsection \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2019.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—No funds allocated to the program described in paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended for commercial application of energy technology.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended by striking the item relating to section 975 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 975. Electricity storage research initiative.”

(h) ENERGY FRONTIER RESEARCH CENTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out a program to provide awards, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, to multi-institutional collaborations or other appropriate entities to conduct fundamental and use-inspired energy research to accelerate scientific breakthroughs.

(2) COLLABORATIONS.—A collaboration receiving an award under this subsection may include multiple types of institutions and private sector entities.

(3) SELECTION AND DURATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A collaboration under this subsection shall be selected for a period of 4 years.

(B) EXISTING CENTERS.—An Energy Frontier Research Center in existence and supported by the Director on the date of enactment of this Act may continue to receive support for a period of 4 years beginning on the date of establishment of that center.

(C) REAPPLICATION.—After the end of the period described in subparagraph (A) or (B), as applicable, a recipient of an award may reapply for selection on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis.

(D) TERMINATION.—Consistent with the existing authorities of the Department, the Director may terminate an underperforming center for cause during the performance period.

(i) MATERIALS RESEARCH DATABASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the program in materials sciences and engineering, the Director shall support the development of a web-based platform to provide access to a database of computed information on known and predicted materials properties and computational tools to accelerate breakthroughs in materials discovery and design.

(2) In carrying out this section, the Director shall—

(A) conduct cooperative research with industry, academia, and other research institutions to facilitate the design of novel materials;

(B) leverage existing high performance computing systems to conduct high-throughput calculations, and develop computational and data mining algorithms for the prediction of material properties;

(C) advance understanding, prediction, and manipulation of materials;

(D) strengthen the foundation for new technologies and advanced manufacturing; and

(E) drive the development of advanced materials for applications that span the Department's missions in energy, environment, and national security.

(3) In carrying out this section, the Director shall leverage programs and activities across the Department.

SEC. 5. ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director shall carry out a research, development, and demonstration program to advance computational and networking capabilities to analyze, model, simulate, and predict complex phenomena relevant to the development of new energy technologies and the competitiveness of the United States.

(b) AMERICAN SUPER COMPUTING LEADERSHIP.—

(1) RENAMING OF ACT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5501 note; Public Law 108-423) is amended by striking “Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004” and inserting “American Super Computing Leadership Act”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 976(a)(1) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16316(1)) is amended by striking “Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004” and inserting “American Super Computing Leadership Act”.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the American Super Computing Leadership Act (15 U.S.C. 5541), as renamed by paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (3) through (6), respectively;

(B) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term ‘Department’ means the Department of Energy.

“(2) EXASCALE COMPUTING.—The term ‘exascale computing’ means computing through the use of a computing machine that performs near or above 10 to the 18th power operations per second.”; and

(C) in paragraph (6) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)), by striking “, acting through the Director of the Office of Science of the Department of Energy”.

(3) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY HIGH-END COMPUTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—Section 3 of the American Super Computing Leadership Act (15 U.S.C. 5542), as renamed by paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “program” and inserting “coordinated program across the Department”;

(B) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “, which may” and all that follows through “multithreading architectures”; and

(C) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) EXASCALE COMPUTING PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a research program (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Program’) for exascale computing, including the development of two or more exascale computing machine architectures, to promote the missions of the Department.

“(2) EXECUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall—

“(i) establish a National Laboratory partnership for industry partners and institutions of higher education for codesign of exascale hardware, technology, software, and applications across all applicable organizations of the Department;

“(ii) acquire multiple exascale computing systems at the existing Departmental facilities that represent at least two distinct technology options developed under clause (i);

“(iii) develop such advancements in hardware and software technology as are required to fully realize the potential of an exascale production system in addressing Department target applications and solving scientific problems involving predictive modeling and simulation, large scale data analytics and management, and artificial intelligence;

“(iv) explore the use of exascale computing technologies to advance a broad range of science and engineering; and

“(v) provide, as appropriate, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, access for researchers in industries in the United States, institutions of higher education, National Laboratories, and other Federal agencies to the exascale computing systems developed pursuant to clause (i).

“(B) SELECTION OF PARTNERS.—The Secretary shall select the partnerships with the computing facilities of the Department under subparagraph (A) through a competitive, peer-review process.

“(3) CODESIGN AND APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(i) carry out the Program through an integration of applications, computer science, applied mathematics, and computer hardware architecture using the partnerships established pursuant to paragraph (2) to ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, two or more exascale computing machine architectures are capable of solving Department target applications and broader scientific problems, including predictive modeling and simulation, large scale data analytics and management, and artificial intelligence; and

“(ii) conduct outreach programs to increase the readiness for the use of such platforms by domestic industries, including manufacturers.

“(B) REPORT.—(i) The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing how the integration under subparagraph (A) is furthering application science data and computational workloads across application interests, including national security, material science, physical science, cybersecurity, biological science, the Materials Genome and BRAIN Initiatives of the President, advanced manufacturing, and the national electric grid.

“(ii) The roles and responsibilities of National Laboratories and industry, including the definition of the roles and responsibilities within the Department to ensure an integrated program across the Department.

“(4) PROJECT REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The exascale architectures developed pursuant to partnerships established pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be reviewed through a project review process.

“(B) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on—

“(i) the results of the review conducted under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) the coordination and management of the Program to ensure an integrated research program across the Department.

“(5) ANNUAL REPORTS.—At the time of the budget submission of the Department for each fiscal year, the Secretary, in consultation with the members of the partnerships established pursuant to paragraph (2), shall submit to Congress a report that describes funding for the Program as a whole by functional element of the Department and critical milestones.”.

(c) HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING AND NETWORKING RESEARCH.—The Director shall support research in high-performance computing and networking relevant to energy applications, including modeling, simulation, machine learning, and advanced data analytics for basic and applied energy research programs carried out by the Secretary.

(d) APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT FOR HIGH-END COMPUTING SYSTEMS, COMPUTATIONAL, AND COMPUTER SCIENCES RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out activities to develop, test, and support—

(A) mathematics, models, statistics, and algorithms for complex systems and programming environments; and

(B) tools, languages, and operations for high-end computing systems (as defined in section 2 of the American Super Computing Leadership Act (15 U.S.C. 5541), as renamed by this section).

(2) PORTFOLIO BALANCE.—The Director shall maintain a balanced portfolio within the advanced scientific computing research and development program established under section 976 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16316) that supports robust investment in applied mathematical, computational, and computer sciences research while accommodating necessary investments in high-performance computing hardware and facilities.

(e) WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.—The Director of the Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research shall support the development of a computational science workforce through a program that—

(1) facilitates collaboration between university students and researchers at the National Laboratories; and

(2) endeavors to advance science in areas relevant to the mission of the Department through the application of computational science.

SEC. 6. HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director shall carry out a research program on the fundamental constituents of matter and energy and the nature of space and time.

(b) MISSION.—The mission of the program described in subsection (a) shall be to support theoretical and experimental research in both elementary particle physics and fundamental accelerator science and technology to understand fundamental properties of the universe.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Director should incorporate the findings and recommendations of the Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel's report entitled “Building for Discovery: Strategic Plan for U.S. Particle Physics in the Global Context”, into the Department's

planning process as part of the program described in subsection (a);

(2) the Director should prioritize domestically hosted research projects that will maintain the United States position as a global leader in particle physics and attract the world's most talented physicists and foreign investment for international collaboration; and

(3) the nations that lead in particle physics by hosting international teams dedicated to a common scientific goal attract the world's best talent and inspire future generations of physicists and technologists.

(d) NEUTRINO RESEARCH.—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall carry out research activities on rare decay processes and the nature of the neutrino, which may include collaborations with the National Science Foundation or international collaborations.

(e) LONG-BASELINE NEUTRINO FACILITY FOR DEEP UNDERGROUND NEUTRINO EXPERIMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for a Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility to facilitate the international Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment to enable a program in neutrino physics to measure the fundamental properties of neutrinos, explore physics beyond the Standard Model, and better clarify the nature of matter and antimatter.

(2) FACILITY CAPABILITIES.—The Secretary shall ensure that the facility described in paragraph (1) will provide, at a minimum, the following capabilities:

(A) A broad-band neutrino beam capable of 1.2 megawatts (MW) of beam power and upgradable to 2.4 MW of beam power.

(B) Four caverns excavated for a forty kiloton fiducial detector mass and supporting surface buildings and utilities.

(C) Neutrino detector facilities at both the Far Site in South Dakota and the Near Site in Illinois to categorize and study neutrinos on their 800-mile journey between the two sites.

(D) Cryogenic systems to support neutrino detectors.

(3) START OF OPERATIONS.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the facility under this subsection occurs before December 31, 2026.

(4) FUNDING.—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for High Energy Physics, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out activities, including construction of the facility, under this subsection—

(A) \$95,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

(B) \$175,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(5) DARK ENERGY AND DARK MATTER RESEARCH.—As part of the program described in paragraph (1), the Director shall carry out research activities on the nature of dark energy and dark matter, which may include collaborations with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the National Science Foundation, or international collaborations.

(6) INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION.—The Director, as practicable and in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies as necessary, shall ensure the access of United States researchers to the most advanced accelerator facilities and research capabilities in the world, including the Large Hadron Collider.

SEC. 7. BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director shall carry out a program of basic research in the areas of biological systems science and environmental science relevant to the development of new energy technologies and to support Department missions in energy, environment, and national security.

(b) BIOLOGICAL SYSTEMS.—The Director shall carry out research and development activities in fundamental, structural, computational, and systems biology to increase systems-level understanding of the complex biological systems, which may include activities—

(1) to accelerate breakthroughs and new knowledge that would enable the cost-effective, sustainable production of—

(A) biomass-based liquid transportation fuels;

(B) bioenergy; and

(C) biobased materials;

(2) to improve understanding of the global carbon cycle, including processes for removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, through photosynthesis and other biological processes, for sequestration and storage; and

(3) to understand the biological mechanisms used to transform, immobilize, or remove contaminants from subsurface environments.

(c) BIOENERGY RESEARCH CENTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out activities under subsection (a), the Director shall select and establish up to 4 bioenergy research centers to conduct basic and fundamental research in plant and microbial systems biology, bio imaging and analysis, and genomics to inform the production of fuels, chemicals from sustainable biomass resources, and to facilitate the translation of basic research results to industry.

(2) SELECTION.—The Director shall select centers under paragraph (1) on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis. The Director shall consider applications from National Laboratories, multi-institutional collaborations, and other appropriate entities.

(3) DURATION.—A center established under this subsection shall receive support for a period of not more than 5 years, subject to the availability of appropriations.

(4) EXISTING CENTERS.—The Director may select a center for participation under this subsection that is in existence, or undergoing a renewal process, on the date of enactment of this Act. Such center shall be eligible to receive support for the duration the 5-year period beginning on the date of establishment of such center.

(5) RENEWAL.—Upon the expiration of any period of support of a center under this subsection, the Director may renew support for the center, on a merit-reviewed basis, for a period of not more than 5 years.

(6) TERMINATION.—Consistent with the existing authorities of the Department, the Director may terminate an underperforming center for cause during the performance period.

(d) LOW DOSE RADIATION RESEARCH PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle G of title IX of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16311 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 977 the following new section:

“SEC. 977A. LOW-DOSE RADIATION RESEARCH PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a basic research program on low-dose radiation to—

“(1) enhance the scientific understanding of, and reduce uncertainties associated with, the effects of exposure to low-dose radiation; and

“(2) inform improved risk-assessment and risk-management methods with respect to such radiation.

“(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—In carrying out the program required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

“(1) formulate scientific goals for low-dose radiation basic research in the United States;

“(2) identify ongoing scientific challenges for understanding the long-term effects of ionizing radiation on biological systems;

“(3) develop a long-term strategic and prioritized basic research agenda to address such scientific challenges in coordination with other research efforts;

“(4) leverage the collective body of knowledge from existing low-dose radiation research; and

“(5) engage with other Federal agencies, research communities, and potential users of information produced under this section, including institutions concerning radiation research, medical physics, radiology, health physics, and emergency response.

“(c) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary, in coordination with the Physical Science Subcommittee of the National Science and Technology Council, shall—

“(1) support the directives under section 106 of the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act (42 U.S.C. 6601 note);

“(2) ensure that the Office of Science of the Department of Energy consults with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Institutes of Health, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Defense, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Department of Homeland Security;

“(3) advise and assist the National Science and Technology Council on policies and initiatives in radiation biology, including enhancing scientific knowledge of the effects of low-dose radiation on biological systems to improve radiation risk-assessment and risk-management methods; and

“(4) identify opportunities to stimulate international cooperation relating to low-dose radiation and leverage research and knowledge from sources outside of the United States.

“(d) RESEARCH PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a 4-year research plan that identifies and prioritizes basic research needs relating to low-dose radiation. In developing such plan, the Secretary shall incorporate the components described in subsection (b).

“(e) DEFINITION OF LOW-DOSE RADIATION.—In this section, the term ‘low-dose radiation’ means a radiation dose of less than 100 millisieverts.

“(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to subject any research carried out by the Secretary for the program under this section to any limitations described in 977(e) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16317(e)).

“(g) FUNDING.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Biological and Environmental Research, the Secretary make available to carry out this section—

“(1) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

“(2) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for subtitle G of title IX of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 977 the following:

“977A. Low-dose radiation research program.”

(e) MODELING RESEARCH.—As part of the activities described in subsection (a), the Director is authorized to carry out research to develop multiscale computational models that incorporate and examine interactions among human and earth systems.

(f) LIMITATION FOR RESEARCH FUNDS.—The Director shall not approve new climate

science-related initiatives without making a determination that such work is well-coordinated with any relevant work carried out by other Federal agencies.

SEC. 8. FUSION ENERGY.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director shall carry out a fusion energy sciences research program to expand the understanding of plasmas and matter at very high temperatures and densities and build the science and engineering foundation needed to develop a fusion energy source.

(b) INERTIAL FUSION ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall carry out a program of research and technology development in inertial fusion for energy applications, including ion beam, laser, and pulsed power fusion systems.

(c) TOKAMAK RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall support research and development activities and facility operations to optimize the tokamak approach to fusion energy.

(2) INTERNATIONAL THERMONUCLEAR EXPERIMENTAL REACTOR CONSTRUCTION.—Section 972 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16312) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) ITER CONSTRUCTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized United States participation in the construction and operations of the ITER project, as agreed to under the April 25, 2007 ‘Agreement on the Establishment of the ITER International Fusion Energy Organization for the Joint Implementation of the ITER Project.’.

“(B) FACILITY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the mission-oriented user facility will enable the study of a burning plasma, and shall be built to have the following characteristics in its full configuration:

“(i) A tokamak device with a plasma radius of 6.2 meters and a magnetic field of 5.3 T.

“(ii) Capable of creating and sustaining a 15-million-Ampere plasma current for greater than 300 seconds.

“(C) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Fusion Energy Sciences, there is authorized for in-kind contributions under this paragraph—

“(i) \$122,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

“(ii) \$163,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

“(D) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—From within funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 of the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018, for Fusion Energy Sciences, there is authorized for cash contributions under this paragraph—

“(i) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

“(ii) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.”

(d) ALTERNATIVE AND ENABLING CONCEPTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the program described in subsection (a), the Director shall support research and development activities and facility operations at United States universities, national laboratories, and private facilities for a portfolio of alternative and enabling fusion energy concepts that may provide solutions to significant challenges to the establishment of a commercial magnetic fusion power plant, prioritized based on the ability of the United States to play a leadership role in the international fusion research community. Fusion energy concepts and activities explored under this paragraph may include—

(A) high magnetic field approaches facilitated by high temperature superconductors;

(B) advanced stellarator concepts;

(C) non-tokamak confinement configurations operating at low magnetic fields;

(D) magnetized target fusion energy concepts;

(E) liquid metals to address issues associated with fusion plasma interactions with the inner wall of the encasing device;

(F) immersion blankets for heat management and fuel breeding;

(G) advanced scientific computing activities; and

(H) other promising fusion energy concepts identified by the Director.

(2) COORDINATION WITH ARPA-E.—The Under Secretary and the Director shall coordinate with the Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (in this paragraph referred to as “ARPA-E”) to—

(A) assess the potential for any fusion energy project supported by ARPA-E to represent a promising approach to a commercially viable fusion power plant;

(B) determine whether the results of any fusion energy project supported by ARPA-E merit the support of follow-on research activities carried out by the Office of Science; and

(C) avoid unintentional duplication of activities.

(e) FAIRNESS IN COMPETITION FOR SOLICITATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES.—Section 33 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2053) is amended by inserting before the first sentence the following: “In this section, with respect to international research projects, the term ‘private facilities or laboratories’ means facilities or laboratories located in the United States.”.

(f) IDENTIFICATION OF PRIORITIES.—

(1) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the fusion energy research and development activities that the Department proposes to carry out over the 10-year period following the date of the report under not fewer than 3 realistic budget scenarios, including a scenario based on 3-percent annual growth in the non-ITER portion of the budget for fusion energy research and development activities.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) identify specific areas of fusion energy research and enabling technology development, including activities to advance inertial and alternative fusion energy concepts, in which the United States can and should establish or solidify a lead in the global fusion energy development effort;

(ii) identify priorities for initiation of facility construction and facility decommissioning under each of the three budget scenarios described in subparagraph (A); and

(iii) assess the ability of the fusion workforce of the United States to carry out the activities identified under clauses (i) and (ii), including the adequacy of programs at institutions of higher education in the United States to train the leaders and workers of the next generation of fusion energy researchers.

(2) PROCESS.—In order to develop the report required under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall leverage best practices and lessons learned from the process used to develop the most recent report of the Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel of the High Energy Physics Advisory Panel.

(3) REQUIREMENT.—No member of the Fusion Energy Sciences Advisory Committee shall be excluded from participating in developing or voting on final approval of the report required under paragraph (1)(A).

SEC. 9. NUCLEAR PHYSICS.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director shall carry out a program of experimental and theoretical

research, and support associated facilities, to discover, explore, and understand all forms of nuclear matter.

(b) ISOTOPE DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION FOR RESEARCH APPLICATIONS.—The Director—

(1) may carry out a program for the production of isotopes, including the development of techniques to produce isotopes, that the Secretary determines are needed for research, medical, industrial, or related purposes; and

(2) shall ensure that isotope production activities carried out under the program under this paragraph do not compete with private industry unless the Director determines that critical national interests require the involvement of the Federal Government.

(c) RENAMING OF THE RARE ISOTOPE ACCELERATOR.—Section 981 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16321) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “**RARE ISOTOPE ACCELERATOR**” and inserting “**FACILITY FOR RARE ISOTOPE BEAMS**”; and

(2) by striking “Rare Isotope Accelerator” each place it appears and inserting “Facility for Rare Isotope Beams”.

(d) FACILITY FOR RARE ISOTOPE BEAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for a Facility for Rare Isotope Beams to advance the understanding of rare nuclear isotopes and the evolution of the cosmos.

(2) FACILITY CAPABILITY.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide for, at a minimum, a rare isotope beam facility capable of 400 kW of beam power.

(3) START OF OPERATIONS.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the start of full operations of the facility under this subsection occurs before June 30, 2022, with early operation in 2018.

(4) FUNDING.—Out of funds authorized to be appropriated under section 11 for Nuclear Physics, there shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out activities, including construction of the facility, under this subsection—

(A) \$101,200,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

(B) \$86,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

SEC. 10. SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out a program to improve the safety, efficiency, and mission readiness of infrastructure at Office of Science laboratories. The program shall include projects to—

(1) renovate or replace space that does not meet research needs;

(2) replace facilities that are no longer cost effective to renovate or operate;

(3) modernize utility systems to prevent failures and ensure efficiency;

(4) remove excess facilities to allow safe and efficient operations; and

(5) construct modern facilities to conduct advanced research in controlled environmental conditions.

(b) APPROACH.—In carrying out this section, the Director shall utilize all available approaches and mechanisms, including capital line items, minor construction projects, energy savings performance contracts, utility energy service contracts, alternative financing, and expense funding, as appropriate.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the Office of Science for fiscal year 2018 \$6,259,903,000, of which—

(1) \$2,090,000,000 shall be for Basic Energy Science;

(2) \$908,000,000 shall be for High Energy Physics;

(3) \$673,000,000 shall be for Biological and Environmental Research;

(4) \$684,000,000 shall be for Nuclear Physics;

(5) \$810,000,000 shall be for Advanced Scientific Computing Research;

(6) \$532,111,000 shall be for Fusion Energy Sciences;

(7) \$257,292,000 shall be for Science Laboratories Infrastructure;

(8) \$183,000,000 shall be for Science Program Direction;

(9) \$103,000,000 shall be for Safeguards and Security; and

(10) \$19,500,000 shall be for Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2019.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the Office of Science for fiscal year 2019 \$6,600,000,000, of which—

(1) \$2,129,233,000 shall be for Basic Energy Science;

(2) \$1,004,510,000 shall be for High Energy Physics;

(3) \$673,000,000 shall be for Biological and Environmental Research;

(4) \$690,000,000 shall be for Nuclear Physics;

(5) \$899,010,000 shall be for Advanced Scientific Computing Research;

(6) \$640,000,000 shall be for Fusion Energy Sciences;

(7) \$257,292,000 shall be for Science Laboratories Infrastructure;

(8) \$181,345,000 shall be for Science Program Direction;

(9) \$106,110,000 shall be for Safeguards and Security; and

(10) \$19,500,000 shall be for Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5905, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5905, the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018.

This legislation authorizes the Department of Energy's Office of Science programs for fiscal years 2018 and 2019. It also authorizes upgrades and new construction of major user facilities at the Department of Energy national labs and universities.

Over the past 4 years, the Energy Subcommittee has met with stakeholders, held hearings, and worked extensively with our colleagues to draft the language included in today's legislation. During this comprehensive process, we spoke with DOE officials, directors of DOE national labs, academia, and industry representatives about the right priorities for these Office of Science programs. The result was a series of bills that the Science, Space, and Technology Committee has advanced through the House this Congress, including H.R. 589, H.R. 4376, H.R. 4377, and H.R. 4675.

The legislation we will consider today combines these bills to form a bipartisan authorization of the department's basic science research. This includes more than \$6 billion in fundamental research and discovery science, largely performed at DOE national laboratories and user facilities around the country.

Last month, I had the opportunity to visit a number of these facilities at Argonne National Laboratory and Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory with several of my Science, Space, and Technology Committee colleagues. We got to see firsthand the incredible work that those researchers do for our country and for the world.

From advanced scientific computing to nuclear physics to fusion energy science, focusing on basic research at our national labs provides the best opportunity for U.S. economic growth and technology innovation.

H.R. 5905 authorizes funding for critical infrastructure projects at these national labs. In the Basic Energy Sciences program, it authorizes upgrades to world-leading X-ray light source facilities around the country, like the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory and the Advanced Light Source at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

These facilities give American scientists the tools they need to study the structure and behavior of both physical and biological materials, enabling innovation in many fields, including creating new materials for industrial as well as pharmaceutical use.

This legislation also authorizes the construction of new DOE research facilities for physics and high-energy physics. This includes construction of the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams, or FRIB, at Michigan State University, which will enable critical nuclear physics research across a wide breadth of fields, ranging from astrophysics to medicine, and eventually the construction of the Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility at Fermilab, an internationally coordinated project to build the world's highest intensity neutrino beam. The research at this facility will help shed light on the universe and its origins.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, also specifically authorizes basic research in fields that are critical to U.S. dominance in science and technology. It authorizes research in exascale computing, electricity storage, and fusion energy sciences. It establishes a DOE exascale computing program, a low-dose radiation research program, and programs for managing our Energy Frontier Research Centers and Bioenergy Research Centers, while also ensuring that we fulfill our commitments to the ITER project for fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

Significant investments in basic science research by foreign countries like China threaten America's global standing as the leader in scientific knowledge. To maintain our competitive advantage as a world leader in science, we must continue to support

the research and research infrastructure that will lead to next generation technologies.

H.R. 5905 is a commonsense bill that will maintain American leadership in science. I want to thank Chairman SMITH, Representative LOFGREN, Vice Chairman LUCAS, and many of my Science, Space, and Technology Committee colleagues for cosponsoring this important legislation. I am grateful for the opportunity to work with the members of this committee to gather research that will help America compete around the world.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5905, the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018. This bill provides important statutory direction to the Department of Energy's Office of Science, which is our Nation's largest supporter of research in the physical sciences. So it is impossible to overstate its importance to our energy future and to our overall innovation enterprise.

This agency also operates more than 30 world-class scientific user facilities, whose applications range from developing new materials for next generation batteries, to new pharmaceuticals that will better treat diseases, to even examining the fundamental building blocks of the universe.

Much of this bill is derived from previous bipartisan, bicameral agreements that were included in H.R. 589, the House-passed Department of Energy Research and Innovation Act of 2017.

As we await Senate action on that legislation, I support moving forward with additional language included in this bill that would authorize upgrades to several important user facilities, direct DOE to provide sufficient support to maintain our commitments to the ITER international fusion project, and provide statutory authority to fund low-dose radiation research as well as a promising computational materials initiative at our national labs.

I also note that I am happy to see robust funding levels included in this bipartisan bill, particularly for the Biological and Environmental Research program, which supports critical research to reduce uncertainties and better understand the impacts of climate change. I strongly support this bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee, Mr. WEBER, the gentleman from Texas, for yielding.

I strongly support this bill, H.R. 5905, the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act of 2018. This bipartisan legislation, sponsored by 12 members of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee authorizes the basic research programs within the DOE Office of Science for fiscal years 2018 and 2019. The programs include research in basic energy sciences, advanced scientific computing, high-energy physics, biological and environmental research, fusion energy science, and nuclear physics.

These basic research programs are the core mission of the Department of Energy and will produce the scientific discoveries that will help maintain U.S. leadership in technology.

This bill also prioritizes basic research funding for solar fuels, electricity storage, bioenergy research, exascale computing, and low-dose radiation research. It provides the Office of Science funding for upgrades and construction of seven high-priority user facilities at DOE national labs.

This legislation is the product of more than 4 years of bipartisan work by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee to advance basic research and set clear science priorities for the Department of Energy.

H.R. 5905 builds on the initiatives included in the House-passed bill, H.R. 589, the Department of Energy Research and Innovation Act, and also incorporates four bipartisan Science, Space, and Technology Committee infrastructure bills that passed the House in February.

One example of the central missions authorized in the DOE Science and Innovation Act is the exascale computing program. Developing an exascale system is critical to enabling scientific discovery, strengthening national security, and promoting U.S. competitiveness. Exascale computing will have real-world benefits for American industry and entice the best researchers in the world to conduct groundbreaking science at the DOE labs.

To strengthen U.S. energy independence, this legislation also supports fusion energy sciences. When commercial fusion becomes available, it will revolutionize the energy market and could significantly reduce global carbon emissions.

H.R. 5905 also authorizes funds for U.S. contributions to the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor project, a critical step to achieving commercial fusion energy.

Again, I want to thank Representative WEBER, as well as Representative LOFGREN, for their longstanding support of basic research and investments in our world-class science facilities at the DOE national labs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

□ 1445

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the distinguished doctor.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5905, the Department of Energy Science and Innovation Act, sponsored by my friend and colleague Representative WEBER. His bill contains the text of my bill, the Low-Dose Radiation Research Act, which unanimously passed the House this past February.

The language directs the Department of Energy to utilize \$20 million to carry out a research program on low-dose radiation within the Office of Science. This program will increase our understanding of the health effects that low doses of radiation have on biological systems.

Research has consistently shown us the adverse health effects associated with high doses of radiation, but we are a long way from accurately assessing the effects of low doses of radiation. As the product of industrial activities, medical procedures, and naturally occurring systems, humans are exposed to low doses of radiation every day, and it is imperative we can accurately assess this risk.

There is broad consensus among the radiobiology community that more research is necessary for Federal agencies, physicians, and related experts to advance the use of radiation technologies. We have invaluable diagnostic tools today, such as CT scans, which emit low doses of radiation. It is vital that physicians are able to inform patients of the health risks associated with these types of imaging processes. As a physician in my home State of Kansas, I have a firsthand understanding of the crucial importance of verified research and ensuring the best medical outcomes for my patients.

I am proud to support this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, by harnessing the strength of our national labs and investing in basic research, H.R. 5905 will help ensure Americans' leadership in science and technology.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank my 11 colleagues on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology who have cosponsored H.R. 5905, including Chairman LAMAR SMITH, Representative ZOE LOFGREN, and Vice Chairman FRANK LUCAS. I also want to thank the dozens of researchers and stakeholders who provided feedback as we developed this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this commonsense, bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is great legislation. Again, I want to urge the adoption of this common-sense, bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5905, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARPA-E ACT OF 2018

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5906) to amend the America COMPETES Act to establish Department of Energy policy for Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5906

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 “ARPA-E Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 5012(b) of the America COMPETES Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(b)) is amended by striking “development of energy technologies” and inserting “development of transformative science and technology solutions to address energy, environmental, economic, and national security challenges”.

(b) GOALS.—Section 5012(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1)(A) and inserting the following:

“(A) to enhance the economic and energy security of the United States through the development of energy technologies that—

“(i) reduce imports of energy from foreign sources;

“(ii) reduce energy-related emissions, including greenhouse gases;

“(iii) improve the energy efficiency of all economic sectors;

“(iv) provide transformative solutions to improve the management, clean-up, and disposal of—

“(I) low-level radioactive waste;

“(II) spent nuclear fuel; and

“(III) high-level radioactive waste;

“(v) improve efficiency and reduce the environmental impact of all forms of energy production;

“(vi) improve the resiliency, reliability, and security of the electric grid; and

“(vii) address other challenges within the mission of the Department as determined by the Secretary; and”;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking “energy technology projects” and inserting “advanced technology projects”.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Section 5012(e)(3)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(e)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “energy”.

(d) STRATEGIC VISION ROADMAP.—Section 5012(h)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(h)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) STRATEGIC VISION ROADMAP.—In the report required under paragraph (1), the Director shall include a roadmap describing the strategic vision that ARPA-E will use to guide the choices of ARPA-E for future technology investments over the following 2 fiscal years.”.

(e) COORDINATION AND NONDUPLICATION.—Section 5012(i)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(i)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Director shall ensure that—

“(A) the activities of ARPA-E are coordinated with, and do not duplicate the efforts of, programs and laboratories within the Department and other relevant research agencies; and

“(B) ARPA-E does not provide funding for a project unless the prospective grantee demonstrates sufficient attempts to secure private financing or indicates that the project is not independently commercially viable.”.

(f) EVALUATION.—Section 5012(l) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(l)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the ARPA-E Act of 2018, the Secretary is authorized to enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences under which the National Academy shall conduct an evaluation of how well ARPA-E is achieving the goals and mission of ARPA-E.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “shall” and inserting “is authorized to”; and

(B) by striking “the recommendation of the National Academy of Sciences” and inserting “a recommendation”.

(g) PROTECTION OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—Section 5012 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o); and

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

“(n) PROTECTION OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The following categories of information collected by ARPA-E from recipients of awards under this section shall be considered privileged and confidential and not subject to disclosure pursuant to section 552 of title 5, United States Code:

“(A) Plans for commercialization of technologies developed under the award, including business plans, technology-to-market plans, market studies, and cost and performance models.

“(B) Investments provided to an awardee from third parties (such as venture capital firms, hedge funds, and private equity firms), including amounts and the percentage of ownership of the awardee provided in return for the investments.

“(C) Additional financial support that the awardee—

“(i) plans to invest, or has invested, into the technology developed under the award; or

“(ii) is seeking from third parties.

“(D) Revenue from the licensing or sale of new products or services resulting from research conducted under the award.

“(2) EFFECT OF SUBSECTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect—

“(A) the authority of the Secretary to use information without publicly disclosing such information; or

“(B) the responsibility of the Secretary to transmit information to Congress as required by law.”.

(h) FUNDING.—Section 5012(o)(4) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(o)(4)), as redesignated by subsection (g)(1), is amended by striking “dur-

ing the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act”.

(i) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 5012(g)(3)(A)(iii) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(g)(3)(A)(iii)) is amended by striking “subpart” each place it appears and inserting “subparagraph”.

(2) Section 5012(o)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 16538(o)(2)), as redesignated by subsection (g)(1), is amended by striking “paragraphs (4) and (5)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5906, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5906, the ARPA-E Act of 2018. This legislation requires the Department to refocus ARPA-E towards developing transformative science and technology solutions to address energy, environment, economic, and national security issues.

ARPA-E was created to ensure that the U.S. energy sector maintained a competitiveness in developing emerging energy technologies. The program was established to help develop high-potential, high-impact energy technologies that were too early stage to attract private sector investment.

ARPA-E was designed to bring this finite R&D funding for a limited time, with the intention to make quick, notable impact on the development of new energy technologies.

In order to accomplish this goal, ARPA-E was given a unique management structure, with flexibility to start and stop research projects that are no longer achieving individual goals, expedited hiring and firing authority to make sure that ARPA-E staff could adequately select and support projects, and the tools to identify market challenges that could affect the advancement in project technologies.

However, we have all heard of the concerns with ARPA-E. The first is the worry that this is just one more of the same from DOE. With the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy program office funded at over \$2.3 billion, it is easy to see why some would ask if we need another clean energy program.

Second, we have all heard of concerns over the years that ARPA-E wasn't meeting its intended goal—to fund the kind of technologies that are so innovative they would never attract private sector investment—but was instead provided funding to big companies with

access to market capital, or funding research that was already under way in other Federal agencies or in the private sector.

The Science, Space and Technology Committee on which I serve as vice chairman particularly explored these concerns under the Obama administration. I believe there were valid concerns that must be addressed for the program to continue.

ARPA-E is a program that can have tremendous impact on the development of new energy technologies, but we can't have another agency playing favorites or handing out grants that distort our energy markets.

The bill we will consider today will address these concerns and enable ARPA-E to apply its innovative approach to a more appropriate set of technology challenges within the DOE mission, as the Trump administration sees it.

It does not—I repeat, this bill does not—authorize new spending or expand the size of the program. H.R. 5906 will refocus the mission of ARPA-E to mirror the full DOE mission and empower the Agency to promote science and technology-driven solutions.

My bill will allow the Agency to solve big challenges, like nuclear waste management and cleanup and improving the reliability, resiliency, and security of the electric grid.

The ARPA-E Act also provides important steps to prevent the duplication of research across DEO and to require applicants to indicate they have attempted to find private sector financing for a particular technology.

This is a good-government reform that is vital to ensuring that ARPA-E can't be abused for crony capitalism purposes in the future. We can't afford to spend limited taxpayer dollars competing with the private sector.

H.R. 5906 will align ARPA-E's innovative approach with the right mission goals and management. It will build on the basic science and early-stage research of the Department and help fast-track new technologies that will grow our economy.

I want to thank Chairman LAMAR SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for cosponsoring this important legislation and for their leadership in advocating the reformed Agency functions within the Department of Energy's missions and goals. I am grateful for the opportunity to work alongside the other members of the committee to craft a bipartisan bill that will improve—yes, improve—a DOE research program but that still allows Congress the opportunity to reduce funding for the program as appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5906, the ARPA-E Act of 2018.

After years of successes and several independent assessments praising

ARPA-E's work, this bill is a welcomed development. It preserves the mission and flexibility of the Agency while enabling it to consider funding projects or technologies that can address DOE's monumental and longstanding challenge of environmental cleanup at the legacy sites of the Manhattan Project.

It also includes language from a bipartisan ARPA-E Reauthorization Act that our committee's ranking member, Ms. JOHNSON, introduced last year, which would ensure that sensitive business information collected by the Agency remains protected. This will enable even greater private sector engagement in its programs.

The ARPA-E projects have attracted more than \$2.6 billion in private sector follow-on funding. Mr. Speaker, 71 projects have formed new companies, and 109 have gone on to partner with other government agencies to further their research.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman LUCAS and Chairman SMITH for embracing ARPA-E's innovative model and joining our Members in supporting its reauthorization. I support this bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, the vice chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology (Mr. LUCAS), for yielding me time on his bill.

The energy bill we are considering is H.R. 5906, the ARPA-E Act of 2018. It establishes clear DOE policy in a new direction and new requirements for the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, called ARPA-E, program.

This legislation updates the mission of ARPA-E to focus on developing technological solutions to energy, economic, environmental, and national security challenges. This includes allowing ARPA-E to develop technologies to address the management, cleanup, and disposal of nuclear waste and to enhance the security and resilience of the electric grid.

H.R. 5906 also maximizes the Department's resources. It requires ARPA-E to coordinate with other DOE programs, avoid duplication, and ensures that ARPA-E grants go to innovative technologies that would not otherwise be funded by the private sector.

The bill reforms ARPA-E but does not authorize any funding for ARPA-E. Instead, H.R. 5906 provides much-needed reform to the ARPA-E program. It also leaves the door open for Congress to readdress ARPA-E funding in the future and determine if the Agency is meeting its intended purpose.

Unfortunately, there have been some mischaracterizations of this legislation, so let the RECORD be clear: Sup-

porting H.R. 5906 will not prevent Congress from cutting—as we did in the House-passed Energy and Water Appropriations bill earlier this month—or even eliminating funding to ARPA-E in the future. Instead, it allows us to enact reforms today that refocus ARPA-E on technology within the DOE mission.

In addition, one organization that opposes this legislation apparently didn't read the bill and confused it with another bill that reauthorizes ARPA-E.

Mr. Speaker, thanks go to Vice Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member JOHNSON for their work on this reform bill and for their support of advanced research around the country.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention one more thing, and it might be of interest to all Members, even those who are not on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. After this bill passes, of the 27 bills that the Science, Space, and Technology Committee has brought to the House floor, 24 of the 27 have, in fact, been bipartisan pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, reforming the mission and the goals of ARPA-E will transform the Agency to do what the DOE does best: develop innovative technology solutions to complex science, energy, and national security challenges.

I again want to thank my nine colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee who cosponsored H.R. 5906, including Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON. I want to thank the new leadership staff at ARPA-E and the Department of Energy, who provided technical comments and policy recommendations as we developed this legislation.

I urge the adoption of this bipartisan, good-government legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am very pleased to support H.R. 5906, the ARPA-E Act of 2018.

Even though the agency is still relatively young, ARPA-E has already demonstrated incredible success in advancing high-risk, high-reward energy technology solutions that neither the public nor the private sector had been willing or able to support in the past. This was highlighted in a Congressionally mandated National Academies review of the agency released last year. Industry leaders like Norm Augustine and Bill Gates have repeatedly called for tripling this agency's budget given the unique role that it is now playing in our energy innovation pipeline.

ARPA-E's impressive track record includes over \$2.6 billion in private sector follow-on funding for a group of 136 ARPA-E projects since the agency's founding in 2009. Equally notable, 71 projects have formed new companies and 109 projects have shown enough promise to result in partnerships with other government agencies for further development.

And I'd be remiss if I didn't refer my colleagues to DOE Secretary Perry's address to the ARPA-E Energy Innovation Summit in March, where he said, and I quote, "ARPA-E is one of the reasons DOE has had and is having such a profound impact on American lives." I couldn't have said this better myself.

The ARPA-E Act of 2018 maintains the structure and nimbleness of this critical agency while also enabling it to help tackle one of the Department of Energy's most expensive, intransigent problems, which is managing and remediating the legacy waste sites from our nation's past production of nuclear weapons. The bill also includes language from the bipartisan ARPA-E Reauthorization Act that I introduced last year which would ensure that sensitive business information collected by the agency remains protected. This will enable even greater private sector engagement in future ARPA-E projects and programs.

I would like to thank Mr. LUCAS and Chairman SMITH for working with me to introduce this bill, and I hope that all Members will support this critical investment in our nation's clean energy future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5906, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

NATIONAL INNOVATION MODERNIZATION BY LABORATORY EMPOWERMENT ACT

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5907) to provide directors of the National Laboratories signature authority for certain agreements, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5907

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 Innovation Modernization by Laboratory Empowerment Act" or the "NIMBLE Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term "Department" means the Department of Energy.

(2) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term "National Laboratory" means a Department of Energy nonmilitary national laboratory, including—

- (A) Ames Laboratory;
- (B) Argonne National Laboratory;
- (C) Brookhaven National Laboratory;
- (D) Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory;
- (E) Idaho National Laboratory;
- (F) Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory;
- (G) National Energy Technology Laboratory;
- (H) National Renewable Energy Laboratory;

- (I) Oak Ridge National Laboratory;
- (J) Pacific Northwest National Laboratory;
- (K) Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory;
- (L) Savannah River National Laboratory;
- (M) Stanford Linear Accelerator Center;
- (N) Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility; and

(O) any laboratory operated by the National Nuclear Security Administration, but only with respect to the civilian energy activities thereof.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR COMMERCIALIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall delegate to directors of the National Laboratories signature authority with respect to any agreement described in subsection (b) the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than \$1,000,000, if such an agreement falls within the scope of—

(1) a strategic plan for the National Laboratory that has been approved by the Department; or

(2) the most recent congressionally approved budget for Department activities to be carried out by the National Laboratory.

(b) AGREEMENTS.—Subsection (a) applies to—

(1) a cooperative research and development agreement;

(2) a non-Federal work-for-others agreement; and

(3) any other agreement determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, in collaboration with the directors of the National Laboratories.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall carry out an agreement under this section in accordance with applicable policies of the Department, including by ensuring that the agreement does not compromise any national security, economic, or environmental interest of the United States.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The director of the affected National Laboratory and the affected contractor shall certify that each activity carried out under a project for which an agreement is entered into under this section does not present, or minimizes, any apparent conflict of interest, and avoids or neutralizes any actual conflict of interest, as a result of the agreement under this section.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS.—Within 30 days of entering an agreement under this section, the director of a National Laboratory shall submit to the Secretary for monitoring and review all records of the National Laboratory relating to the agreement.

(4) RATES.—The director of a National Laboratory may charge higher rates for services performed under a partnership agreement entered into pursuant to this section, regardless of the full cost of recovery, if such funds are used exclusively to support further research and development activities at the respective National Laboratory.

(d) EXCEPTION.—This section does not apply to any agreement with a majority foreign-owned company.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 12 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting the subparagraphs appropriately;

(B) by striking "Each Federal agency" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each Federal agency"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in accordance with section 3(a) of the NIMBLE Act, approval by the Secretary of Energy shall not be required for any technology transfer agreement proposed to be entered into by a National Laboratory of the Department of Energy, the total cost of which (including the National Laboratory contributions and project recipient cost share) is less than \$1,000,000."; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "subsection (a)(1)" each place it appears and inserting "subsection (a)(1)(A)".

SEC. 4. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act abrogates or otherwise affects the primary responsibilities of any National Laboratory to the Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of bipartisan legislation I introduced with my good friend from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) to give our national labs the tools they need to better work with outside entities, develop new technologies, and let new business ideas come out of our world-leading research facilities.

As you have heard today with the prior bills passed on the floor, the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee has done tremendous bipartisan work to support our national laboratories and research infrastructure.

I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON—both from Texas—for their bipartisan work on this package, and I was pleased to see my prior past research infrastructure legislation dealing with upgrades at Fermilab, Argonne National Laboratory, and Oak Ridge National Laboratory included in that package.

Our national labs are often referred to as the crown jewels in our research ecosystem here in the United States. Secretary Perry has referred to them as national treasures. These labs house some of the largest, most complicated research equipment in the world, which no one business or research university would ever be able to support.

Our national labs also maintain a number of user facilities where university researchers, other Federal agencies, and the private sector can work with these tools, so long as this work does not interfere with the mission of the department or the lab.

The problem we have with many agreements is simply the time that it takes to negotiate and finalize an agreement. Currently, after a lab makes a determination on an agreement, that agreement must then go through a separate review by the department. While I wholeheartedly agree in our need for thorough oversight, what we are attempting to do is to set a threshold so that smaller agreements do not need to go through this additional review process.

All national labs, except one, have been set up under a government-owned, contractor-operated model. What my bill would do is strengthen this arrangement by giving the labs the necessary trust they need to remain nimble, being able to react to the needs of the private sector and with other researchers being able to come in.

When many researchers need to use a facility for just a few hours, they, obviously, will not wait around 90 days for the government. The private sector does not move at the pace of government, nor should we expect it to. This legislation would cut out some of the red tape of working with the lab, so that the private sector could take good ideas and do what they do best: innovate and react to the market.

With the increased reporting requirements for these agreements, I believe this strikes the proper balance for oversight with the department and the intentions of Congress in creating the government-owned, contractor-operated model for the labs.

I am grateful for the Secretary at our recent hearing signaling his willingness to work with this idea. I believe it fits with the administration's priorities in removing red tape where it is not needed and freeing the private sector up to innovate and bring new ideas to the marketplace.

So I thank my colleagues for their work on this legislation. I also thank the chairman for his cosponsorship of this bill, as well as his leadership on the package of bills authorizing the Office of Science and other DOE activities.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support passage of this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5907, the National Innovation Modernization by Laboratory Empowerment Act.

This bill would provide our national laboratories with the authority to directly enter into certain research agreements with the private sector, as long as those activities align with the laboratories' strategic plans approved by the Department of Energy. This bill also includes appropriate safeguards to prevent waste, fraud, or abuse of this provision.

This language previously passed the House as part of bipartisan legislation that we considered in the last Con-

gress. I am happy to see this important policy change is moving forward once again.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. I encourage my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the very effective and helpful chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and also cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HULTGREN for yielding me time on his bill, H.R. 5907, the National Innovation Modernization by Laboratory Empowerment Act, or NIMBLE Act.

This legislation authorizes the Secretary of Energy to provide signature authority to the directors of the national laboratories, allowing these lab directors to make funding decisions on cooperative agreements with industry where the total cost is less than \$1 million.

This commonsense reform provides the labs with more flexibility and eliminates the red tape and bureaucratic process that makes it difficult for businesses to partner with the labs.

DOE national labs can provide the private sector with access to critical research infrastructure as they develop new technologies. But a burdensome approval process can smother an industry's interest and constrict the pace of technology development. This bill gives the labs freedom to pursue agreements that will increase U.S. competitiveness and maintain our innovation and productivity leadership.

I thank Representative RANDY HULTGREN again and this bill's 10 Science, Space, and Technology Committee's cosponsors, including Representative ED PERLMUTTER, Vice Chairman FRANK LUCAS, Energy Subcommittee Chairman RANDY WEBER, and Energy Subcommittee Vice Chairman Steve Knight for their ongoing support of DOE's world-leading national laboratories.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say about Mr. HULTGREN that his leadership on the committee has been appreciated for years. He has never failed to be an effective advocate and leader for the national labs. This is a good example of his interests being put into legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank my good friend from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for his support on this bill. I especially want to thank my really good friend from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, for his important support on this bill. It really is a commonsense bill. It is one that has passed previous Congresses with strong, bipartisan support.

Our labs are a treasure, but they are also a great benefit for innovation. This allows that innovation to continue working, again, on smaller agreements, for those to be able to move more quickly, when, oftentimes, business need to move that quickly. The labs can do this, but if they had to go through the whole cumbersome process of coming through Washington, they wouldn't be able to.

So, again, this is commonsense and bipartisan, and I thank all of the cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5907.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 5515, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5515) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 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, with the Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Carbajal moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 5515 be instructed to agree to section 703 of the Senate bill.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to instruct.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this motion would bring TRICARE contraception on par with the Affordable Care Act by prohibiting cost sharing for any method of contraception provided in the TRICARE retail pharmacy network or mail order.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's servicemembers should be provided the same access to preventive healthcare as those insured under the Affordable Care Act.

Currently, TRICARE beneficiaries, including non-Active servicemembers and their dependents, and certain Active military members, do not have the same access to cost-free preventive care as civilians do.

By requiring coverage for contraceptives with no out-of-pocket costs, the ACA increases women's access to contraceptives and saves women \$255 per year, on average. This is a benefit we currently deny our female servicemembers. One-third of our U.S. military are women. Currently, about 15 percent of Active Duty servicemembers and 19 percent of the Reserve forces are comprised of women.

Women are bravely serving in all parts of the military, including infantry and other combat units. Servicewomen are continuing to break barriers across the military, proving again and again that they are indispensable when it comes to defending this Nation.

Unfortunately, this House continues to refuse these brave servicemembers access to the same healthcare that all civilian females have access to.

Preventive healthcare services, including contraception, should be provided to all TRICARE beneficiaries without any copays. Access to preventive healthcare is vital for the health and quality of life of all women serving this Nation, but it is also critical to the readiness of our military.

In 2008, researchers found that the rate of unintended pregnancy was roughly 50 percent higher among servicemembers compared to the general population. This problem is made worse by the fact that it is often difficult for female servicemembers to access this preventive medication in the field.

Another recent study found that, among servicemembers who use contraceptives, only 24 percent brought enough medication to last their entire deployment. Forty-one percent of those needing refills found them difficult to obtain while deployed on Active Duty.

We should not make it more difficult for these women to access contraception by asking them to pay for medication that the civilian population already receives at no cost. We are doing

an absolute disservice to those who are willing to sacrifice their lives to defend our Nation every day by denying them preventive healthcare that is critical to treat certain health conditions and for family planning.

The Senate has included this TRICARE provision in their bill for the past 2 years because they understand this issue goes beyond political parties and personal views. This is about the health and well-being of those who are sacrificing their lives every day to defend our Nation. This is about providing the resources and delivering policies to the military that will increase readiness.

This motion would provide all servicemembers access to preventive healthcare, which they not only deserve, but are entitled to, and I would say earned.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, today, to put politics aside and follow in the Senate's footsteps and support this motion.

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

□ 1515

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has just laid out a number of arguments in support of a Senate provision. There are obviously Members who may think differently on his arguments, although I do not believe this is the time or the place to have that debate. That will be discussed in the course of the upcoming conference with the Senate.

At this point, I would just like to offer two thoughts. One is the provision that the gentleman talks about requires that there be a mandatory spending offset. Now, when you look for how that spending can be offset, really, the Armed Services Committee only has two ways: one is to increase TRICARE copays, pharmacy copays, and the second one is to reduce retirement benefits. So I notice that the gentleman's motion to instruct does not deal with that part of the equation.

My thought is that it is far better to look at the whole universe of issues in the course of a conference rather than to try to dictate one outcome or another that doesn't include how you pay for something.

Second point, Mr. Speaker, there are 907 House provisions and 603 Senate provisions that will be the subject of this conference. They will all have to be hashed out in one way or another, but the conferees should have the flexibility to deal with all of those 907 and 603 provisions in a way that makes the most sense for national security.

So my suggestion is that the House reject this particular motion and allow the conferees to do their work in looking at the whole universe of what is best for the men and women who serve and what is best for the country's national security.

Mr. Speaker, I would inform the gentleman that I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those comments from my good friend and chairman of the Armed Services Committee, but the fact of the matter is that, for 2 years, we have not been able, in conference, to address this very important issue. There is always one excuse or a barrier raised at one time or another. And, in fact, what ends up resulting is our servicewomen, who are putting their lives on the line for our country, are being treated as second-class citizens. They are not afforded the same equality as their male counterparts and those in the civilian world.

Mr. Speaker, what this motion does is simply achieve parity with prevailing law. I want to point out that TRICARE beneficiaries want this parity, and it is time we finally deliver.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion. Let us finally provide all servicemembers with the same access to preventive healthcare that we all have access to.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to say that there are a number of provisions which Members on one side or the other consider inequitable, and a big part of the challenge we face is, okay, to enact a particular provision, you have to pay for it.

So my point is we need to look at the whole universe not only of what we would like to have done, but also of how it would be paid for.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to instruct conferees will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to close conference.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 188, nays 231, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

YEAS—188

Adams	Beyer	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	F.
Barragán	Blumenauer	Brady (PA)
Bass	Blunt Rochester	Brown (MD)
Beatty	Bonamici	Brownley (CA)
Bera		Bustos

Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Galleo
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings

NAYS—231

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte

O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Keating
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halloran

Goody
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)

Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman

Black
Cramer
Crowley

Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus

NOT VOTING—8

Gosar
Rush
Thompson (MS)

□ 1547

Messrs. DUNCAN of South Carolina, POSEY, LAMALFA, GAETZ, LONG, YOUNG of Alaska, and LOUDERMILK changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. ADAMS, Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut and HASTINGS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct conferees was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO PERMIT CLOSED CONFERENCE MEETINGS ON H.R. 5515, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, I move that meetings of the conference between the House and Senate on H.R. 5515 may be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information may be discussed, provided that any sitting Member of Congress shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, the motion is not debatable, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 15, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

YEAS—403

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings

Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Galleo
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating

Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lesko
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Loftgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halloran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascarelli
Paulsen
Payne

Pearce	Rutherford	Thompson (PA)
Pelosi	Ryan (OH)	Thornberry
Perlmutter	Sánchez	Tipton
Perry	Sanford	Titus
Peters	Sarbanes	Torres
Peterson	Scalise	Trott
Pingree	Schakowsky	Turner
Pittenger	Schiff	Upton
Poe (TX)	Schneider	Valadao
Poliquin	Schrader	Vargas
Posey	Schweikert	Veasey
Price (NC)	Scott (VA)	Vela
Quigley	Scott, Austin	Velázquez
Raskin	Scott, David	Visclosky
Ratcliffe	Sensenbrenner	Wagner
Reed	Serrano	Walberg
Reichert	Sessions	Walden
Renacci	Sewell (AL)	Walker
Rice (NY)	Shea-Porter	Walorski
Rice (SC)	Sherman	Walters, Mimi
Richmond	Shimkus	Wasserman
Roby	Shuster	Schultz
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Waters, Maxine
Rogers (AL)	Sinema	Weber (TX)
Rogers (KY)	Sires	Webster (FL)
Rohrabacher	Smith (MO)	Welch
Rokita	Smith (NE)	Wenstrup
Rooney, Francis	Smith (NJ)	Westerman
Rooney, Thomas J.	Smith (WA)	Williams
Ros-Lehtinen	Smucker	Wilson (FL)
Rosen	Soto	Wilson (SC)
Roskam	Speier	Wittman
Ross	Stefanik	Womack
Rothfus	Stivers	Woodall
Rouzer	Suozzi	Yarmuth
Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)	Yoder
Royce (CA)	Takano	Yoho
Ruiz	Taylor	Young (AK)
Ruppersberger	Tenney	Young (IA)
Russell	Thompson (CA)	Zeldin

NAYS—15

Amash	Jones	Moore
Blumenauer	Lee	Pocan
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Polis
Ellison	Massie	Tonko
Jayapal	McGovern	Watson Coleman

NOT VOTING—9

Black	Gosar	Thompson (MS)
Cramer	Rush	Tsongas
Crowley	Smith (TX)	Walz

□ 1555

So the motion to close portions of the conference was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 961 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6157.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1556

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on June 26, 2018, amendment No. 24 printed in part

A of House Report 115-783 offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 115-783 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. LANGEVIN of Rhode Island, and

Amendment No. 20 by Mr. POE of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 302]

AYES—188

Abraham	Delaney	Khanna
Allen	DeLauro	Kihuen
Babin	Demings	King (NY)
Bacon	DeSantis	Knight
Banks (IN)	Dingell	Lamb
Bass	Donovan	Lamborn
Beatty	Duffy	Lance
Bera	Emmer	Langevin
Bergman	Estes (KS)	Larsen (WA)
Bilirakis	Esty (CT)	Larson (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Lawrence
Bishop (UT)	Flores	Lewis (MN)
Blunt Rochester	Foster	Lieu, Ted
Brady (PA)	Fudge	Lipinski
Brooks (AL)	Gabbard	LoBiondo
Brooks (IN)	Gaetz	Love
Brown (MD)	Gallagher	Lowey
Budd	Gallego	Lynch
Butterfield	Garamendi	Maloney
Capuano	Garrett	Carolyn B.
Carbajal	Gianforte	Maloney, Sean
Cárdenas	Gohmert	Marchant
Carson (IN)	Gonzalez (TX)	McCaul
Carter (TX)	Gottheimer	McEachin
Cartwright	Graves (GA)	McGovern
Castro (TX)	Graves (MO)	McNerney
Cheney	Green, Gene	McSally
Ciilline	Gutiérrez	Meeks
Clay	Hanabusa	Messer
Cleaver	Harper	Mitchell
Clyburn	Hartzler	Mooney (WV)
Coffman	Hastings	Moulton
Cohen	Hice, Jody B.	Murphy (FL)
Comstock	Higgins (LA)	Napolitano
Conaway	Higgins (NY)	Neal
Cook	Himes	Newhouse
Correa	Hoyer	Nolan
Costa	Hunter	Norcross
Costello (PA)	Jeffries	O'Halleran
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Olson
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Palazzo
Culberson	Katko	Panetta
Cummings	Keating	Pascarell
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Paulsen
DeFazio	Kelly (MS)	Pelosi
DeGette	Kennedy	Perlmutter

Peters	Sánchez	Torres
Peterson	Sanford	Turner
Pingree	Schweikert	Veasey
Poe (TX)	Sensenbrenner	Vela
Poliquin	Sewell (AL)	Wagner
Posey	Sherman	Walden
Quigley	Sinema	Walorski
Richmond	Smith (MO)	Wasserman
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Schultz
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Weber (TX)
Rooney, Francis	Smith (WA)	Webster (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Soto	Wenstrup
Rosen	Speier	Wilson (SC)
Rothfus	Stefanik	Woodall
Ruiz	Stewart	Yoho
Ruppersberger	Suozzi	Zeldin
Russell	Tenney	
Ryan (OH)	Thornberry	

NOES—228

Adams	Graves (LA)	Nunes
Aderholt	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Aguilar	Griffith	Pallone
Amash	Grijalva	Palmer
Amodei	Grothman	Payne
Arrington	Guthrie	Pearce
Barletta	Handel	Perry
Barr	Harris	Pittenger
Barragán	Heck	Pocan
Barton	Hensarling	Polis
Beyer	Herrera Beutler	Price (NC)
Biggs	Hill	Raskin
Bishop (MI)	Holding	Ratcliffe
Blackburn	Hollingsworth	Reed
Blum	Hudson	Reichert
Blumenauer	Huffman	Renacci
Bonamici	Huizenga	Rice (NY)
Bost	Hultgren	Rice (SC)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hurd	Roby
Brady (TX)	Jackson Lee	Roe (TN)
Brat	Jayapal	Rogers (KY)
Brownley (CA)	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney, Thomas J.
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Roskam
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Bustos	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Byrne	Jordan	Royce (CA)
Calvert	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford
Calvert	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Carter (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Chabot	Kilmer	Schiff
Chu, Judy	Kind	Schneider
Clark (MA)	King (IA)	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	Kinzie	Scott (VA)
Cole	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Serrano
Comer	LaHood	Sessions
Connolly	LaMalfa	Shea-Porter
Cooper	Latta	Shimkus
Crawford	Lawson (FL)	Shuster
Crist	Lee	Simpson
Curbelo (FL)	Lesko	Sires
Davidson	Levin	Smucker
Davis, Danny	Lewis (GA)	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Loeb sack	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Lofgren	Takano
Denham	Long	Taylor
DeSaulnier	Loudermilk	Thompson (CA)
DesJarlais	Lowenthal	Thompson (PA)
Deutch	Lucas	Tipton
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Titus
Doggett	Lujan Grisham,	Tonko
Doyle, Michael F.	M.	Trott
Duncan (SC)	Luján, Ben Ray	Upton
Duncan (TN)	MacArthur	Valadao
Dunn	Marino	Vargas
Ellison	Marshall	Velázquez
Engel	Massie	Visclosky
Eshoo	Mast	Walberg
Espallat	Matsui	Walker
Evans	McCarthy	Walters, Mimi
Faso	McClintock	Waters, Maxine
Ferguson	McCollum	Watson Coleman
Fleischmann	McHenry	Welch
Fortenberry	McKinley	Westerman
Fox	McMorris	Williams
Frankel (FL)	Rodgers	Wilson (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Wittman
Gibbs	Meng	Womack
Gomez	Moolenaar	Yarmuth
Goodlatte	Mullin	Yoder
Gosar	Nadler	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Noem	Young (IA)
Granger	Norman	

NOT VOTING—11

Black Issa Thompson (MS)
Cramer Labrador Tsongas
Crowley Rush Walz
Curtis Smith (TX)

□ 1602

Mses. ADAMS, KAPTUR, and Mr. LEVIN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. PAULSEN and LANCE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 241, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

AYES—175

Abraham Gallagher Loudermilk
Allen Garrett Luetkemeyer
Amash Gianforte Marchant
Arrington Gibbs Marino
Babin Gohmert Massie
Bacon Goodlatte Mast
Banks (IN) Gosar McClintock
Barton Gotthelmer McKinley
Biggs Gowdy McMorris
Bilirakis Graves (GA) Rodgers
Bishop (MI) Graves (LA) McSally
Blackburn Graves (MO) Meadows
Blum Green, Gene Messer
Brady (TX) Griffith Mooney (WV)
Brat Grothman Moulton
Brooks (AL) Guthrie Mullin
Buck Harper Nadler
Bucshon Hartzler Napolitano
Budd Herrera Beutler Newhouse
Burgess Hice, Jody B. Nolan
Carter (GA) Higgins (LA) Norman
Castor (FL) Higgins (NY) O'Rourke
Chabot Hill Olson
Coffman Holding Palazzo
Cohen Hudson Palmer
Collins (GA) Huizenga Paulsen
Collins (NY) Hultgren Pearce
Comer Hunter Perry
Comstock Jenkins (KS) Poe (TX)
Cook Jenkins (WV) Poliquin
Crawford Johnson (LA) Posey
Culberson Johnson (OH) Ratcliffe
Cummings Johnson, Sam Reed
Curbelo (FL) Jones Renacci
Davidson Jordan Rice (SC)
Davis, Rodney Katko Roe (TN)
DeSantis Keating Rohrabacher
DesJarlais Kelly (MS) Rokita
Doggett Kind Rooney, Francis
Donovan King (IA) Ross-Lehtinen
Duffy King (NY) Ross
Duncan (SC) Knight Rothfus
Duncan (TN) Kustoff (TN) Rouzer
Emmer LaHood Royce (CA)
Estes (KS) LaMalfa Russell
Ferguson Lesko Sanford
Foxy Lewis (MN) Scalise
Gabbard Lofgren Schweikert
Gaetz Long Sensenbrenner

Sherman
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Stefanik
Stivers
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Tonko

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Barietta
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Cuellar
Curtis
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle, Michael
F.
Dunn
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)

NOES—241

Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Granger
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harris
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Himes
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaull
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Noem

Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

Black Issa Thompson (MS)
Cooper Labrador Tsongas
Cramer Rush Walz
Crowley Smith (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1608

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMERICAN INNOVATION \$1 COIN ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 770) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Beginning on page 6, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 8, line 5, and insert the following:

“(A) ORDER OF ISSUANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The coins issued under this subsection commemorating either an innovation, an individual innovator, or a group of innovators, from each State, the District of Columbia, or a territory shall be issued in the following order:

“(I) STATE.—With respect to each State, the coins shall be issued in the order in which the States ratified the Constitution of the United States or were admitted into the Union, as the case may be.

“(II) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND TERRITORIES.—After all coins are issued under subsection (I), the coins shall be issued for the District of Columbia and the territories in the following order: 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.

“(ii) APPLICATION IN EVENT OF THE ADMISSION OF ADDITIONAL STATES.—Notwithstanding clause (i), if any additional State is admitted

into the Union before the end of the 14-year period referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Treasury may issue a \$1 coin with respect to the additional State in accordance with clause (i)(1).

“(iii) APPLICATION IN THE EVENT OF INDEPENDENCE OR ADDING OF A TERRITORY.—Notwithstanding clause (i)—

“(I) if any territory becomes independent or otherwise ceases to be a territory of the United States before \$1 coins are minted pursuant to this subsection, the subsection shall cease to apply with respect to such territory; and

“(II) if any new territory is added to the United States, \$1 coins shall be issued for such territories in the order in which the new territories are added, beginning after the \$1 coin is issued for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(B) ISSUANCE OF COINS COMMEMORATING FOUR INNOVATIONS OR INNOVATORS DURING EACH OF 14 YEARS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Four \$1 coin designs as described in this subsection shall be issued during each year of the period referred to in paragraph (1) until 1 coin featuring 1 innovation, an individual innovator, or a group of innovators, from each of the States, the District of Columbia, and territories has been issued.

“(ii) NUMBER OF COINS OF EACH DESIGN.—The Secretary shall prescribe, on the basis of such factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the number of \$1 coins that shall be issued with each of the designs selected for each year of the period referred to in paragraph (1).

Mr. HENSARLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTH KOREAN HUMAN RIGHTS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2061) to reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “North Korean Human Rights Reauthorization Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In 2014, the United Nations Commission of Inquiry (COI) on Human Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) found that the grave human rights violations still being perpetrated against the people of North Korea, due to policies established at the highest level of the state, amount to crimes against humanity. Crimes include forced starvation, sexual

violence against women and children, restrictions on freedom of movement, arbitrary detention, torture, executions, and enforced disappearances, among other hardships.

(2) The COI also noted that the Government of the People's Republic of China is aiding and abetting in crimes against humanity by forcibly repatriating North Korean refugees back to the DPRK. Upon repatriation, North Koreans are sent to prison camps, tortured, or even executed. The Government of the People's Republic of China's forcible repatriation of North Korean refugees violates its obligation to uphold the principle of non-refoulement, under the United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva July 28, 1951 (as made applicable by the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, done at New York January 31, 1967 (19 UST 6223)).

(3) Estimates from the COI suggest that between 80,000 and 120,000 people are believed to be imprisoned in political prison camps in North Korea. Another 70,000 are believed to be held at other detention facilities. Prisoners in both situations are subject to harsh conditions, limited food, sexual abuse, and in most cases hard labor.

(4) One of the findings of the COI report was the persecution of religious minorities, especially Christians. There is effectively no freedom of religion in North Korea, only worship of the Kim family. Christians are subjected to particularly acute persecution. It has been reported that Christians in North Korea have been tortured, forcibly detained, and even executed for possessing a Bible or professing Christianity.

(5) North Korea profits from its human rights abuses. A 2014 report from the Asian Institute for Policy Studies suggests that there are nearly 50,000 North Korean workers forced to labor overseas, sometimes without compensation, and for as much as 20 hours at a time. Workers that received compensation were not to be paid more than \$150 per month, which is between 10 to 20 percent of the value of the labor they performed. Based on this report, the regime may profit as much as \$360,000,000 annually from just 50,000 laborers.

(6) On July 6, 2016, the United States imposed sanctions on North Korean leader Kim Jong Un and other senior North Korean officials for human rights violations as required by the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-122). This was the first time that the United States had designated North Korean officials for human rights abuses.

(7) The North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-122) requires the President to impose mandatory penalties under United States law on any person that “knowingly engages in, is responsible for, or facilitates serious human rights abuses by the Government of North Korea”.

(8) Although the United States Refugee Admissions Program remains the largest in the world by far, the United States has only resettled 212 refugees from North Korea since the date of the enactment of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-333).

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Government should continue to make it a priority to improve information access in North Korea by exploring the use of new and emerging technologies and expanding nongovernmental radio broadcasting to North Korea, including news and information;

(2) the United Nations has a significant role to play in promoting and improving human rights in North Korea and should press for access for the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in North Korea as well as the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights;

(3) because North Koreans fleeing into China face a well-founded fear of persecution upon their forcible repatriation, the United States should urge China to—

(A) immediately halt the forcible repatriation of North Koreans;

(B) allow the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees unimpeded access to North Koreans inside China to determine whether such North Koreans require protection as refugees;

(C) fulfill its obligations under the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, and the Agreement on the Upgrading of the UNHCR Mission in the People's Republic of China to UNHCR Branch Office in the People's Republic of China (signed December 1, 1995);

(D) address the concerns of the United Nations Committee against Torture by incorporating the principle of non-refoulement into Chinese domestic legislation; and

(E) recognize the legal status of North Korean women who marry or have children with Chinese citizens, and ensure that all such children are granted resident status and access to education and other public services in accordance with Chinese law and international standards;

(4) the President should continue to designate all individuals found to have committed violations described in section 104(a) of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 2914(a)), regarding complicity in censorship and human right abuses;

(5) the United States currently blocks United States passports from being used to travel to North Korea without a special validation from the Department of State, and the Department of State should continue to take steps to increase public awareness about the risks and dangers of travel by United States citizens to North Korea;

(6) the United States should continue to seek cooperation from all foreign governments to allow the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) access to process North Korean refugees overseas for resettlement and to allow United States officials access to process refugees for resettlement in the United States (if that is the destination country of the refugees' choosing); and

(7) the Secretary of State, through diplomacy by senior officials, including United States ambassadors to Asia-Pacific countries, and in close cooperation with South Korea, should make every effort to promote the protection of North Korean refugees and defectors.

SEC. 4. RADIO BROADCASTING TO NORTH KOREA.

Section 103(a) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7813(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “that the United States should facilitate” and inserting the following: “that the United States should—

“(1) facilitate”;

(2) in paragraph (1), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section—

(A) by striking “radio broadcasting” and inserting “broadcasting, including news rebroadcasting,”; and

(B) by striking “increase broadcasts” and inserting “increase such broadcasts, including news rebroadcasts,”; and

(C) by striking “Voice of America.” and inserting the following: “Voice of America; and”;

and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “(2) expand funding for nongovernmental organization broadcasting efforts, prioritizing organizations that engage North Korean defectors in programming and broadcast services.”.

SEC. 5. ACTIONS TO PROMOTE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION.

Section 104(a) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7814(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The President” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President”;

(2) by inserting “, USB drives, micro SD cards, audio players, video players, cell phones, wi-fi, wireless internet, web pages, internet, wireless

telecommunications, and other electronic media that shares information" before the period at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) **DISTRIBUTION.**—In accordance with the sense of Congress described in section 103, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, is authorized to distribute or provide grants to distribute information receiving devices, electronically readable devices, and other informational sources into North Korea, including devices and informational sources specified in paragraph (1). To carry out this paragraph, the President is authorized to issue regulations to facilitate the free-flow of information into North Korea.

"(3) **RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT GRANT PROGRAM.**—In accordance with the authorization described in paragraphs (1) and (2) to increase the availability and distribution of sources of information inside North Korea, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, is authorized to establish a grant program to make grants to eligible entities to develop or distribute (or both) new products or methods to allow North Koreans easier access to outside information. Such program may involve public-private partnerships.

"(4) **CULTURE.**—In accordance with the sense of Congress described in section 103, the Broadcasting Board of Governors may broadcast American, Korean, Chinese, and other popular music, television, movies, and popular cultural references as part of its programming.

"(5) **RIGHTS AND LAWS.**—In accordance with the sense of Congress described in section 103, the Broadcasting Board of Governors should broadcast to North Korea in the Korean language information on rights, laws, and freedoms afforded through the North Korean Constitution, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and any other applicable treaties or international agreements to which North Korea is bound.

"(6) **RELIGIOUS MINORITIES.**—Efforts to improve information access under this subsection should include religious communities and should be coordinated with the Office of International Religious Freedom to ensure maximum impact in improving the rights of religious persons in North Korea.

"(7) **BROADCASTING REPORT.**—Not later than—
 "(A) 180 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Broadcasting Board of Governors, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that sets forth a detailed plan for improving broadcasting content for the purpose of targeting new audiences and increasing listenership; and
 "(B) 1 year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, and annually thereafter for each of the next 5 years, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Broadcasting Board of Governors, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report including—

"(i) a description of the effectiveness of actions taken pursuant to this section, including data reflecting audience and listenership, device distribution and usage, and technological development and advancement usage;
 "(ii) the amount of funds expended by the United States Government pursuant to section 403; and
 "(iii) other appropriate information necessary to fully inform Congress of efforts related to this section."

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HUMANITARIAN COORDINATION RELATED TO THE KOREAN PENINSULA.

Title III of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7841 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 306. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HUMANITARIAN COORDINATION RELATED TO THE KOREAN PENINSULA.
 "It is the sense of Congress that—

"(1) any instability on the Korean Peninsula could have significant humanitarian and strategic impact on the region and for United States national interests; and

"(2) as such, the United States Government should work with countries sharing a land or maritime border with North Korea to develop long-term whole-of-government plans to coordinate efforts related to humanitarian assistance and human rights promotion and to effectively assimilate North Korean defectors."

SEC. 7. REAUTHORIZATION PROVISIONS.

(a) **SUPPORT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY PROGRAMS.**—Section 102 of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7812(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following: "The President is also authorized to provide grants to entities to undertake research on North Korea's denial of human rights, including on the political and military chains of command responsible for authorizing and implementing systemic human rights abuses, including at prison camps and detention facilities where political prisoners are held."; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "2017" and inserting "2022".

(b) **ACTIONS TO PROMOTE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION.**—Section 104 of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7814) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—
 (A) by striking "\$2,000,000" and inserting "\$3,000,000"; and
 (B) by striking "2017" and inserting "2022"; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking "2017" and inserting "2022".

(c) **REPORT BY SPECIAL ENVOY ON NORTH KOREAN HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES.**—Section 107(d) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7817(d)) is amended by striking "2017" and inserting "2022".

(d) **REPORT ON UNITED STATES HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.**—Section 201 of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7831) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "2017" and inserting "2022";

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

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

"(b) **NEEDS ASSESSMENT.**—The report shall include a needs assessment to inform the distribution of humanitarian assistance inside North Korea."

(e) **ASSISTANCE PROVIDED OUTSIDE OF NORTH KOREA.**—Section 203(c)(1) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7833(c)(1)) is amended by striking "2013 through 2017" and inserting "2018 through 2022".

(f) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Section 305(a) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7845(a)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "2017" and inserting "2022".

SEC. 8. REPORT BY BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(1) describes the status of current United States broadcasting to North Korea and the extent to which the Board has achieved the goal of 12-hour-per-day broadcasting to North Korea, in accordance with section 103(a) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7813(a)); and

(2) includes a strategy to overcome obstacles to such communication with the North Korean people, including through unrestricted, unmonitored, and inexpensive electronic means.

(b) **FORM.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 9. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE AUTHORIZATIONS.

Section 403 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-122; 22 U.S.C. 9253) is hereby repealed.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2069

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2069.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 5515, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 5515:

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. THORNBERRY, WILSON of South Carolina, LoBIONDO, BISHOP of Utah, TURNER, ROGERS of Alabama, SHUSTER, CONAWAY, LAMBORN, WITTMAN, COFFMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. AUSTIN, SCOTT of Georgia, COOK, BYRNE, Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. BACON, BANKS of Indiana, SMITH of Washington, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Messrs. LANGEVIN, COOPER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

From Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of title

XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. LATTI, JOHNSON of Ohio, and PALLONE.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of title XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HENSARLING, BARR, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title XVII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE of California, KINZINGER, and ENGEL.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will announce the appointment of additional conferees at a subsequent time.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 964 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6157.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1614

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today pursuant to House Resolution 961, amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 115-783 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to House Resolution 964, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 155-785 and available pro forma amendments described in section 3 of House Resolution 961.

Each further amendment printed in the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except amendments described in section 3 of House Resolution 961, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wyo-

ming (Ms. CHENEY) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, during the previous administration, deep funding cuts as well as budget dysfunction in Congress have allowed a real atrophy of our military readiness in the Department of Defense. We have seen a steep decline in our capabilities while at the same time our adversaries have been making advances and increasing their ability to threaten us.

We now face a situation, particularly with nations like China and Russia, where they are developing capabilities that we may not be able to defend against.

Countering this threat requires funding for the space-based missile defense tracking system in line 117 of the defense-wide RDTE account, funding that was authorized but not included in the appropriations bill.

This capability is absolutely critical to improving our missile defense capabilities, particularly to address the rapidly increasing threat from hypersonic weapons, which our committee has placed particular focus on this year with broad bipartisan support.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, funding was not included in line 92 of the defense-wide RDTE account to continue critical development of laser scaling technologies for boost-phase ICBM missile defense. This technology has the potential that we need and that is crucial to give our warfighters the capability to shoot down missiles while they are still in a boost phase, making our adversaries have to think twice, understanding that missiles they fire at us could be destroyed over their own soil.

Mr. Chairman, funding for both of these capabilities is included in both the House and Senate version of the NDAA.

I have offered amendments, Mr. Chairman, to provide funding for these capabilities consistent with the NDAA and the Missile Defense Agency's revised budget request for fiscal year 2019. In an effort to allay concerns about finding offsets for these, I am willing to withdraw my amendments, and I would ask Chairwoman GRANGER for a commitment to fully support the capabilities during the conference process on the appropriations bill in the Senate.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for her support of our missile defense programs. I agree with her support for these capabilities. I fully commit to working with her during the conference process to ensure both the missile defense tracking system and the laser scaling technologies for boost-phase ICBM missile defense are funded in the conference report.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's willingness to work with me on this important issue, as well as her tireless work on this critical bill. I will not be offering my amendments.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BARTON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to terminate a Reserve Officers' Training Corps program at—

(1) a Historically Black College or University (which has the meaning given the term "part B institution" in section 322 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061));

(2) a Hispanic-serving institution (as defined in section 502 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1101a)); or

(3) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1059c)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, my amendment indicates that no funding in this act shall be used or otherwise made available by this act to end Reserve Officers' Training Corps, ROTC, programs at HBCUs, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and Tribal Colleges and Universities.

I want to emphasize this program because so many of us have these colleges in our congressional districts. Those ROTC programs provide training to college students to prepare them for future service in the branches in the U.S. military, the Army, Air Force, and Navy.

Coming from the State of Texas, I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, with my interaction with so many in the United States military, those who have said that it is a pathway to leadership and success, I know how important these programs are.

The Army ROTC alone provides \$274 million in scholarship money to more than 13,000 students. It is interesting to take note of the fact, as it relates to African Americans and Hispanics, the leadership that has come from these programs: Andrew P. Chambers, lieutenant general, retired; George A. Alexander; Colonel Claude A. Burnett; Colonel Derrick W. Flowers; Colonel Senodja Sundiata-Walker, currently serving as the chief of program support branch.

These are all individuals who have been the beneficiaries of ROTC programs at HBCUs, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and Tribal Colleges and Universities.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, while I will not oppose the amendment, I will urge caution about proposals that limit the department's flexibility to adapt to changes in its need in the ROTC program.

I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for her remarks and concern. I believe that the military has great interest in the ROTC program and particularly in recruitment in HBCUs and Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

Let me also say, however, Mr. Chairman, I want to rise to emphasize my commitment to PTSD funding. I want to ensure as we go forward that we will increase the PTSD funding. I am interested in it being increased in particular by \$5 million, but I know there are other amendments that would increase it even more.

If we know the suffering from those who have PTSD as I have, this is something that I have worked for, fought for, and advocated for. The reason, Mr. Chairman, is I see it every day.

My amendment would focus on the needs of those who want to live a normal life with post-traumatic stress disorder. Our soldiers are still coming back from places like Syria. We know they have come back from Afghanistan and Iraq, but they are still fighting there. And PTSD, recently diagnosed in these wars, to give these people the ability to be with their family, to be able to have positions because the treatment is there, to regain their life because what they have seen from the bloodshed of IEDs and the tragedies of war warrant this support of post-traumatic stress disorder funding.

So I want to make note of that on the RECORD, of my support and the support for the increase. I close by saying I ask for those in support of the Jackson Lee amendment dealing with the ROTC, HBCUs, Hispanic-Serving and Tribal Institutions. It is a valuable program and a valuable use for that program to recruit more people from those communities.

Mr. Chairman, I ask support for the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chair, I thank the Chair and Ranking Member of the Rules Committee for making this Jackson Lee Amendment in order for consideration of "H.R. 6157, the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019."

I also thank Chair KAY GRANGER and Ranking Member PETER J. VISCLOSKEY for their work in bring the Defense Appropriations bill before the House for consideration.

This Jackson Lee Amendment is No. 1 on the Second Rule for H.R. 6157 and provides that no funding in this Act shall be used or otherwise made available by this Act to end Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) programs at HBCUs, Hispanic Serving Institutions and Tribal Colleges and Universities.

ROTC provides training to college students to prepare them for future service in branches of the U.S. military: the Army, Air Force, and Navy.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force ROTC programs are annual scholarship awards, which combined, are the nation's largest scholarship grantors.

The Army ROTC alone provides \$274 million in scholarship money to more than 13,000 students each year, according to the U.S. Army Cadet Command.

Nationally about 12,000 high school seniors compete for about 2,000 Army ROTC scholarships.

About half of these are three-year scholarships, and the other half are four-year scholarships.

Once students reach college, they can explore specific military branches by enrolling in ROTC programs provided by the Army, Navy, or Air Force.

ROTC programs train future officers to serve in the U.S. Armed Forces.

To students who qualify, the ROTC programs offer scholarships that cover the cost of their education.

In exchange, students make a commitment to maintain academic excellence and later to fulfill active duty services in their chosen branch of the Armed Forces.

ROTC programs reward academic excellence to students attending HBCUs, Hispanic Serving Institutions, and Tribal Colleges by providing a path to military service.

I ask my Colleagues in the House to support this Jackson Lee Amendment to the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019.

LIST OF HBCUs WITH NAVY ROTC PROGRAMS

Clark Atlanta University (Georgia)
Dillard University (Louisiana)
Florida A&M University
Hampton University (Virginia)
Howard University (Washington DC)
Huston-Tillotson University (Texas)
Morehouse College (Georgia)
Norfolk State University (North Carolina)
Prairie View A&M University (Texas)
Savannah State University (Georgia)
Southern University and A&M College (Louisiana)
Spelman College (Georgia)
Tennessee State University
Tuskegee University (Alabama)
Xavier University (Louisiana)

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCUs) WITH ARMY ROTC

Alabama A&M University
Alcorn State University
Bowie State University
Central State University
Elizabeth City State University
Florida A&M University
Fort Valley State University
Grambling State University
Hampton University
Howard University
Jackson State University
Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)
Lincoln University (Missouri)
Morgan State University
Norfolk State University
North Carolina A&T State University
Prairie View A&M University
Saint Augustine's College
South Carolina State University
Southern University and A&M College
Tuskegee University
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
Virginia State University
West Virginia State University

LEARN HOW PEOPLE HAVE GAINED FROM ROTC LEADERSHIP THAT LASTS A LIFETIME
LTG (Ret) Andrew P. Chambers, Lieutenant General, U.S. Army, Retired

LTG (Ret) Chambers graduated from Howard University and Commission as an Infantry Officer in 1954. After 35 years of service LTG Chambers retired from the Army in 1989. He then held the position of Director of Industry Operations for the Association of the United States Army, later assumed the role of Director of Community Services for AmeriCorps and then served as Vice President of University of Maryland University College Europe, retiring in 2005.

LTG (Ret) Chambers passed away on June 3, 2017 (age 86) and was buried with full military honors at Arlington Nation Cemetery.

MG (Ret) George A. Alexander, Former Deputy Surgeon General, Office of the U.S. Army Surgeon General, HQS, Department of the Army

MG (Ret) Alexander is an active alumni and strong supporter of the Howard University Army ROTC Program. He graduated from Howard University College of Medicine in 1977 and was commissioned in 1979.

COL Claude A. Burnett

Currently serving the Chief of the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Acting Chief of the Division of Surgery at Landstuhl Regional Medical Center, Landstuhl, Germany

COL Burnett graduated from Howard University with a BS in Chemistry and received his commission in 1992. He went on to obtain his medical degree from Meharry Medical College in Nashville, TN.

COL Derrick W. Flowers

Currently the G-8/Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Resource Management, Headquarters, US Army Medical Command, for Sam Houston, TX.

COL Flowers received his Bachelor of Business Administration Degree in Accounting and commission as a Medical Services Corps officer from Howard University in 1990.

COL Senodja F. Sundiata-Walker

Currently serving as the Chief of Program Support Branch, Washington D.C.

COL Sundiata-Walker graduated and received her commission from Howard University as a Military Intelligence Officer in 1995.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the gentlewoman in a colloquy on the importance of the Butler County workforce to Federal background investigation operations. The National Background Investigations Bureau has approximately 1,500 employees and contractors in Boyers, Pennsylvania, which is in my district, who handle the intake and processing of Federal background investigations.

As you know, the NDAA last year split the NBIB between the Office of Personnel Management and the Department of Defense. This misguided move would have disrupted operations and negatively affected the critical workforce.

I applaud the Trump administration for announcing last week that it will be keeping the NBIB intact and shifting it entirely to the DOD. This action will keep all background investigations under the same agency and will retain economies of scale to efficiently perform these critical operations.

On Monday, I met with the DOD officials responsible for the transfer. They assured me that there are no plans to move any jobs outside Butler County. This is good news for my constituents, but more communication is necessary.

These 1,500 people perform an incredible service to our Nation, and these jobs are critical to Butler County. This workforce has the expertise and experience to perform this sensitive work that keeps our Nation secure. Any efforts to reduce backlog in background investigations must utilize this talented and hardworking workforce.

Chairman GRANGER, would you agree that the NBIB workforce in Butler County is integral to our country's background checks operations?

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's commitment to this matter. We respect the dedication and accomplishments of all National Background Investigations Bureau workers, including the hard work of the staff in Butler County, Pennsylvania. There is currently a backlog of more than 700,000 pending security clearance cases.

Air Force Secretary Heather Wilson told my subcommittee that the Air Force has 79,000 people still waiting for security clearances, and that number has almost doubled in the last 18 months. We want to work with your office to make sure we address that as much as possible, and I look forward to your continuing partnership in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her dedication to this issue. It is important to not lose sight of the significance of this workforce to my district.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. FRANKEL OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000) (increased by \$4,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, research shows that when women have a seat at the table, the prospect that peace negotiations will succeed rises significantly.

The Women, Peace, and Security Act enacted into law last year requires the Department of Defense to leverage the unique roles women bring to the table in peace building, conflict resolution, and military operations.

This amendment would build on this law by allocating additional funding for full-time gender advisers, training foreign security forces on how to include women in their security efforts, and research on women's contributions to security at the National Defense University.

Mr. Chair, according to Womankind World, which is a global women's rights organization, women and girls suffer disproportionately during violent conflict. Sexual violence is often used as an instrument of war. Although men and boys also may be abused, it is this way that women and girls are primarily targeted. For example, during Sierra Leone's 11-year civil war, an estimated 250,000 women experienced sexual violence.

The destabilizing effect of conflict on families and communities can mean other forms of violence increasing in intensity, including domestic violence, sexual exploitation, and trafficking. Refugee women and girls are especially vulnerable.

Although they are disproportionately affected by conflict, women seem to be sidelined from formal conflict resolution and peace processes, meaning that postconflict recovery and reconciliation programs often overlook women's specific needs.

Over the last two decades, women accounted for just 9 percent of negotiators at peace tables. Out of 585 peace agreements from 1990 to 2010, only 92 contained any reference to women.

Despite that, women play an essential role in building peace in local communities. However, of course, women face multiple barriers. Even so, evidence shows that formal peace agreements that include women's perspectives are most likely to last.

Mr. Chair, we have an opportunity to make women's voices heard and to make the world a safer place. I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, women have a larger presence in our military today than ever before, with more than 200,000 women serving in Active-Duty military. Women serve as leaders in all jobs and in all branches of the military. Women have served in

every conflict from the American Revolution to the current war on terror.

From their early days as cooks and nurses to the combat roles they fulfill today, the roles of women have evolved with the military. So I am pleased to support this amendment, which will continue to further the growth of our 21st century women warfighters.

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL). The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I want to speak about the production of the Tomahawk cruise missile.

The Tomahawk is a battle-tested weapon that has been used in combat over 2,300 times. Tomahawks were launched in 2016 and again in April of this year in response to the Syrian regime's use of chemical weapons. The Tomahawk continues to be a credible, standoff weapon that provides lethal effects while keeping American fighting men and women in relative safety.

The 2018 National Defense Strategy prioritizes action against near-peer nations with significant area-denial capabilities. The Tomahawk is the Nation's preferred weapon to carry out this difficult mission. Halting production and devastating the missile's industrial base is ill-advised as the threat of near-peer warfare increases.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's interest in this critical weapons system, and I want to assure him that the committee supports the continued production of Tomahawk missiles.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the committee's support for the program and was encouraged to see additional funding for increased Tomahawk missile production in FY18. I would like to emphasize that this funding was provided at the Navy's request. However, I understand that the Navy recently informed the committee that they intend to utilize this for purchasing support equipment instead of missiles, as the committee intended.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, the gentleman is correct. The committee increased funding for Tomahawk production 2 years in a row. Using this funding for other purposes is contrary to congressional direction, and this is the second year in a row that the Navy has blatantly disregarded our instructions. The action by the Navy led the committee to recommend a rescission of prior year funding for Tomahawks.

Despite this rescission, the committee remains supportive of additional Tomahawk production and is

awaiting a revised plan from the Navy on how they will spend the previously appropriated funding for missile production.

I assure the gentleman from Utah that the committee will revisit this issue in conference, when the Navy indicates affirmatively they will use additional funding solely for missile production.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I agree with the chairwoman that the Navy's disregard for congressional direction and intent is unacceptable. I appreciate her support for this important war-fighting capability. I look forward to resolving this issue in conference.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 3 will not be offered.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask for the chairwoman's assistance on an impending threat to our national security.

Roads surrounding military installations play an important role in preserving military readiness. Our Armed Forces need to mobilize quickly, and we need functional roads in order to do that. The same is true for other infrastructure supporting defense communities where our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines live and raise their families.

This is a problem all over this country and a severe one, but it is especially acute right outside Joint Base Lewis-McChord in the 10th Congressional District of Washington, which I have the privilege to represent and is the largest force projection base in the Western United States. More than 50,000 people report to work there every day. It is the second most requested location in the Army, second to Hawaii. Still, I am thrilled when they get new things like, recently, the C-17 Weapons Instructor Course and a Security Force Assistance Brigade.

What I am not thrilled about is the frustratingly long wait times at the front gate for JBLM or the heavy traffic diverting through neighborhoods to avoid traffic jams.

My very first term in Congress, I introduced the COMMUTE Act to help address these issues. I have been working on the problem every year since. This year, both the House and Senate authorizing committees acknowledged this need by creating the Defense Community Infrastructure Program, or DCIP. This program builds off the COMMUTE Act and encourages infrastructure projects near military installations that are caused by their presence.

I know being stuck in traffic is not something unknown to most Americans. We are all too familiar with the horrible feeling of approaching an unexpected slow crawl on the road. But when this affects our military's ability to get to the base to do the job and be ready for anything, that is when we can't just sit and sit and wait and wait, as I have, year in and year out, for it to get better.

If servicemembers cannot get on and off base, they may decide to never leave the base. But military bases are not islands in our districts. They are integral parts of the community. Expecting servicemembers to stay behind the force protection of their bases exacerbates the civil-military divide.

It is shortsighted and foolhardy not to consider the infrastructure surrounding and supporting our installations. The Federal Government must play a role in addressing military community infrastructure projects.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentleman for raising the issue of off-base infrastructure. I know the gentleman has been working on this issue since his first days in Congress, and I commend his dedication.

I appreciate that the authorizing committee has given us a tool to begin to address this problem. Unfortunately, we don't yet know the full scope of the challenge. Before we can appropriate funds to a program like the Defense Community Infrastructure Program, we need more information to define the priorities and ensure that the most urgent needs are met.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman very much for acknowledging this problem and for her commitment to work to address it.

Over the summer, I will work with relevant stakeholders, including the authorizing committees, the Secretary of Defense, and the Association of Defense Communities, which strongly supports this proposal, to get the gentlewoman and her staff a sense of the scope of this problem.

I look forward to working with the Defense Subcommittee on tackling the problem and finding the resources to update and repair infrastructure around military bases.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, yes, I can commit to working on this issue if the gentleman can give me the details on the scope of what we need to solve.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. ROSEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment No. 4, which I am offering with Congressman HASTINGS, would designate an additional \$5 million for the training and retention of cybersecurity professionals under the defense-wide operation and maintenance account.

We discuss cybersecurity frequently here in Congress because cyberspace touches everything. As a former computer programmer and a member of both the Armed Services Committee and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I can tell you that we rely on cyberspace for so much: our military, schools, businesses, State and local governments.

We all understand the importance of prioritizing cybersecurity and the defense of cyberspace, because the challenges we are already facing will continue to grow both at home and abroad.

Actors half a world away are targeting our hospitals, banks, and financial networks, not to mention military installations. Attacks are getting more sophisticated, and they are happening every single day.

Last year, the GAO reported that, between fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2015, cybersecurity incidents increased from over 5,500 to over 77,000, an increase of more than 1,300 percent. The report recommended that the Federal Government enhance efforts for recruiting and retaining a qualified cybersecurity workforce and improve cybersecurity workforce planning activities.

As we look to defend ourselves, we need the very best talent. I am particularly aware of the need for expanding partnerships with academia and the private sector, which will create the cybersecurity people pipeline that our government and our private sector businesses need.

Programs like the National Centers of Academic Excellence, jointly sponsored by the Department of Homeland Security and the National Security Agency, for instance, serve as examples of the direction we should be headed.

As U.S. Cyber Command steps up its recruiting efforts, we must ensure that the necessary resources for training the next generation of cybersecurity specialists are made available now, wherever they are needed. This amendment is just a drop in the bucket, but it demonstrates how seriously we take this issue.

I want to thank my distinguished colleague, Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS, for helping to lead this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, the Department of Defense is responsible for defending the homeland and U.S. interests from attack, including attacks that may occur in cyberspace. This is an important mission and one that this bill prioritizes by providing \$8 billion across the entire cybersecurity landscape.

Our Nation's cybersecurity posture starts with our cybersecurity professionals. The gentlewoman's amendment provides an additional \$5 million to ensure that we continue to have the most qualified and highly trained cybersecurity professionals in the world.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair and the ranking member for their willingness to hear this amendment. I also want to thank the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. MCGOVERN, for ruling that this amendment is in order.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would provide an additional \$10 million to the defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency, formerly known as JPAC, for its newly expanded mission to bring home our missing servicemembers in North Korea.

In light of the recent agreement that includes a commitment to recover and repatriate U.S. POW/MIA remains from North Korea, we must ensure that the DPAA will be able to move quickly to take advantage of this unexpected opportunity.

As most Members are aware, nearly 8,000 U.S. servicemembers are still categorized as missing in action and presumed dead from World War II, the Korean war, and the Vietnam war. According to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the remains of about 5,300 of our sons and daughters in uniform are be-

lieved to be in North Korea. Many of them fell in battle near the Battle of Chosin Reservoir in November and December of 1950, the scene of one of the most heroic battles in U.S. military history, and certainly U.S. Marine Corps history.

Mr. Chairman, it has been 65 years since the Korean war ceasefire was put into effect. For those brave Americans and so many American families, to be still missing after so long is a tragedy. These brave servicemembers and their families deserve better.

□ 1645

Mr. Chairman, I have been involved with this issue for the past 8 years. I actually went out with JPAC to the South Pacific and the Philippines, to Vietnam and to Korea to observe their recovery efforts.

I had a chance to visit the headquarters at Hickam Air Force Base at Pearl Harbor where a dedicated group of our forensic pathologists are working tirelessly to use modern techniques to identify each of our brave heroes and return them to their families and their hometowns to receive the dignified and respectful remembrance that they deserve.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very unique opportunity. We have to act quickly. The mitochondrial DNA that allows us to identify our sons and daughters in uniform breaks down over time because of conditions in the soil. If we don't act quickly, we will lose this opportunity.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, as discussed yesterday on the Allen-Raskin amendment, I support the work of the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Office. They perform tireless work to track, locate, and recover our fallen heroes, and I thank them for their continued efforts.

That is why the base bill already includes \$10 million above the budget request. I supported the Allen-Raskin amendment yesterday, which provides an additional \$10 million above the request. This amendment provides \$10 million, which will support continued efforts to return our fallen heroes home where they belong.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I simply want to join the chairwoman. She has correctly pointed out that there is a significant increase in the bill, but I do support the amendment, as does the chairwoman.

As was pointed out, we do need to act quickly. Most of the 82,000 Americans

that remain missing are from World War II, the Korean war, and Vietnam. With the most recent of those wars ending over 40 years ago, fewer and fewer immediate families of those missing are still alive. I do think we should have a sense of urgency.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's amendment, and I appreciate him yielding.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman for her indulgence and also thank the ranking member. I ask Members to support this amendment to support the DPAA in its efforts to find and repatriate our missing heroes.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 18, line 4, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$2,100,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, my amendment to the fiscal year 2019 Defense Appropriations bill will fund the first-ever study of a subject the Department of Defense has identified as "one of the most significant barriers to sexual assaults being reported."

The amendment carries with it bipartisan support, and I would like to thank Republican Representative MIA LOVE and Democratic Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER for joining me in cosponsoring this amendment, because they recognize its importance.

For far too long, servicemembers have survived sexual assaults only to suffer in silence. They have refused to bring their assailants to justice and receive medical attention not because they fear their attacker, but, rather, they fear a military policy which requires that their commanders punish them for minor violations. These transgressions are brought to light during the investigation of their assault. Consequently, many survivors decide against reporting their attacks and bringing their assailants to justice.

A RAND survey of military members who survive sexual assaults but refuse to report the attacks found that 22 percent feared being punished for collateral misconduct. The list of survivors who have had their military careers ruined because they demanded justice is also lengthy, but the only facts I can offer you are a survey and anecdotal evidence.

Not a single branch of the military systematically tracks this collateral misconduct. Our only previous effort to examine an aspect of the subject came in 2016. The FY 2017 NDAA, which passed with bipartisan support, directed the Pentagon's inspector general to review the cases of survivors who were separated from the service after reporting their assaults.

The IG reported 22 percent of these survivors couldn't have their cases reviewed because their military records had gone missing. Moreover, 67 percent of the records were incomplete.

This funding will support a first-ever study to be conducted by the Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Services, otherwise known as DAC-IPAD. That study was introduced by my bill required by the fiscal year 2019 NDAA, which the House passed earlier this year. The funds would pay for the lawyers needed to fund a long-overdue, in-depth, and independent review of collateral misconduct.

We know that collateral misconduct is an issue, but we need to know just how pervasive it is and gather information on when and how it manifests to empower our commanders to, hopefully, solve this problem. We owe it to our men and women in uniform to study and review collateral misconduct.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, the military and society at large must do more to change the stigma of sexual assault so victims are not afraid of retaliation when coming forward and reporting the crime.

This bill provides \$318 million for sexual assault prevention and response programs at the service level and at the Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program. This is \$35 million above the President's request.

I understand this amendment funds a report required by the 2019 House-passed National Defense Authorization Act, to which we do not object.

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

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GALLAGHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$23,800,000)".

Page 22, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$23,800,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment to restore \$24 million for Navy AIM-120 Delta AMRAAM procurement to match House-passed NDAA levels.

When he rolled out the National Defense Strategy, Secretary Mattis was clear: "Great power competition, not terrorism, is now the primary focus of U.S. national security."

Nowhere is this competition more intense than in the Indo-Pacific, where the "fight tonight" mission has never been more urgent, given threats from both great powers and rogue regimes.

Pentagon leaders have been clear: addressing critical munitions shortfalls such as the AMRAAM is a top priority.

During his confirmation, the new Indo-PACOM commander, Phil Davidson, listed critical munitions stockpiles as one of his top two capability and capacity challenges to addressing threats in the Indo-Pacific. Admiral Davidson went on to list advancements in air-to-air munitions—and the AIM-120D in particular—as his top solution to challenges presented by anti-access area-denial capabilities.

Unfortunately, our AMRAAM inventory is currently at only 50 percent of the requirement—50 percent. We cannot afford to cut any further.

It is no surprise, then, that the Statement of Administration Policy on this bill singles out munitions reductions as an area of special concern. To quote the Statement of Administration Policy: "DOD still has shortfalls in preferred munitions needed to achieve successfully the operational plans identified in the National Defense Strategy." And the very first munition mentioned is the AIM-120D AMRAAM.

Let's be clear about the implications here. The NDS is about great power competition. Our ability to win—or, much preferably, deter a great power war—comes down to our ability to execute these plans and impose our will on our adversaries.

These same adversaries are watching American defense spending debates

right now, looking for signs such as failing to address publicly reported shortfalls, that America is not serious about long-term competition. Decisions like this, here and now, may seem small, but they all add up to tell a story that our friends and our foes, alike, receive loud and clear.

Last year, on a bipartisan basis, we were able to help address key Mark 48 torpedo shortfalls in this appropriations bill in order to address a critical war-fighting need. I hope we can build on this success this time around.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to match the House-passed authorization level as well as the administration request, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to reverse a justified reduction made by the committee to the request for the AMRAAM missile program.

Both the Navy and the Air Force, historically, overestimate the cost of the missile in their budget request. In the last 5 years, this overestimation has been 12 percent, on average. The fiscal year 2019 request assumes a unit cost that is 16 percent more than the most recent contract.

For several years in a row, Congress has adjusted the budget request for this program to account for these overestimates and other facts of life, such as production delays. In fact, the delivery schedule for this program has been revised 25 times since 2011, and the production of new guidance system components is 21 months behind schedule.

The Department, itself, has frequently sought to take savings from the AMRAAM program for other priorities. For example, the Air Force has, 5 years straight on, sought approval to reprogram a total of \$57 million of this program to other needs. This is in addition to the reductions that have been taken by Congress. It, therefore, defies the facts to claim that this program is being underfunded.

Because of the long time it takes the Department of Defense to put together its budget request, these requests do not always reflect the most current information. The committee takes commonsense reductions when they will do no harm to national security.

I must add that this is precisely the sort of commonsense reduction to the President's budget that enables us to accommodate the priorities of Members of this body. This year we received approximately 6,600 such requests.

The committee will continue to engage with the Navy and Air Force on this program and make adjustments as needed. This amendment, however, would restrict our ability to ensure that the priorities of this body are reflected in the final bill.

Mr. Chair, I, therefore, oppose the amendment and urge its rejection, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chair, I would say I am all for finding efficiencies wherever we can get them, particularly in a very tight budgetary environment. That is why, in structuring this amendment, we need a concerted effort to prioritize the urgent operational requirements faced day in and day out in the Pacific where, notwithstanding any past delays, the balance of power, I would argue, is rapidly shifting against us and where any further shifts could really harm our ability to project power in the future.

We have also provided the Defense Contract Management Agency the flexibility to make modest steps toward finding efficiencies in its budget. Even after accounting for this offset, DCMA O&M would be funded at nearly \$25 million over the House-passed NDAA level.

I would also say, our offset supports House-passed NDAA reductions to bureaucratic overhead in the so-called DOD fourth estate. In line with finding efficiencies, the fourth estate is comprised of the organizations within DOD that do not report to a military service and have proven difficult to manage or oversee, and I think the savings identified will go directly toward critical munitions for the warfighter—in other words, maximizing tooth while minimizing tail—getting as much of the resource as possible out of the bureaucracy in the Pentagon and at the front lines where our warfighters need it most.

□ 1700

I have enormous respect for the chairwoman's position, I appreciate her willingness to consider this, and I appreciate the robust debate.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, in closing, as I have stated, these sorts of commonsense adjustments to the President's budget request must be made to ensure efficient use of taxpayer dollars and accommodate higher priorities, including Member priorities.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GALLAGHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$33,000,000)".

Page 28, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$33,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, as with the preceding amendment, this proposal addresses critical munitions shortfalls, this time by providing \$33 million for Air Force AIM-120D AMRAAM procurement to match the NDAA.

The same argument for Navy AMRAAM procurement apply equally to this amendment as well. In order to support Indo-PACOM's fight tonight mission, we must increase our stockpiles of critical munitions. With our AMRAAM inventory currently at 50 percent of the requirement, we cannot afford to see further cuts.

This amendment would simply restore the House-passed NDAA level for Air Force AMRAAM procurement, and addresses one of the specific concerns outlined in the SAP on this bill.

I understand the argument on finding efficiencies. I just think it is worth remembering, particularly when we look at that region of the world, that aggression in the Pacific has historically caught our country off guard. After all, not only did the attack on Pearl Harbor and the North Korean advance past the 38th parallel come as a surprise, but we were similarly stunned by the rapid Chinese entry into the Korean war.

These mistakes cost American lives and forced our men and women in uniform to play catch-up. And I know that such a level of conflict may seem unthinkable in the post-Cold War world, but history has a way of, if not repeating itself, rhyming from time to time.

While this small investment will not inoculate us entirely against being caught flat-footed once again, it is a small step towards addressing critical munition shortfalls and giving our combatant and commanders the tools they need to deter conflict in the first place; and, if the worst does happen, be ready with the munitions they need.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct in his assertion that his amendment restores the cut

made by the committee of \$23.8 million in this program.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to point out for my colleagues that there is a misimpression of our subcommittee that we simply helter-skelter approve anything that the Department of Defense sends up, but we try to give discrete decisions to each program and to rearrange those moneys. There was a cut from the administration's request, and that money was put into readiness, which is a huge concern for the Department.

And, historically, on the program that the gentleman references, my remarks would very much mirror those of the gentlewoman from his last amendment. Historically, the Air Force, along with the Navy, overestimates that the cost of the missile just discussed, on average, the cost has been overestimated by 12 percent.

For the fiscal year 2019 budget submission, the unit cost is 16 percent more than the most recent contract for production. The budget request for this program has been adjusted for several years now, due to the overestimates submitted and other factors, such as revisions to delivery schedules, and a 21-month delay for components.

The committee works with the military services to ensure the program receives the funding needed to produce this munition, and adjustments are made. The subcommittee did make an adjustment. I believe it is in our Nation's interest to leave that \$23.8 million in readiness.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Chairman, I know, to some extent, we always seem to be making choices between near-term readiness requirements and long-term modernization efforts. I would submit, however, that that is a false choice, or perhaps is a choice that has been foisted upon us by bad budgetary decisions that we have made in the past 6 years.

The reality is, if you take a look at the world, we are going to have to do both things at the same time: invest in both readiness and modernization.

So I have enormous respect for those efforts to find efficiencies and make sure we can put dollars where people need them most. I simply, on balance, would like to put money in the hands of warfighters who are dealing with threats on the front lines as much as humanly possible.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I simply close by making the observation: the gentleman talks about choices. The committee did make a choice for readiness as opposed to munition, where we have a 21-month delay in components.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 32, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, which would increase funding for USSOCOM to provide for additional training of Special Operations Forces. Simply put, I never want our men and women in uniform to be in a fair fight. My amendment would allow for an increase in the training budget to ensure, whenever our forces are deployed, they have been fully prepared and are ready to fight, win, and return home safely.

Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest honors of my life is representing Fort Bragg, the epicenter of the universe, and home of the airborne and of the Army Special Operations Command. The units stationed here represent the best of the best and have a vast footprint across our Nation.

As our Nation continues to fight terrorism around the world, while simultaneously preparing for the threats of near-peer adversaries, our training requirements increase and diversify.

As a result, we must ensure that we are ready for any situation at a moment's notice. Readiness cannot be built overnight. A Green Beret cannot be built overnight. In order to conduct their mission set effectively, we must provide them with a steady stream of predictable resources to enable them to train and prepare for the dangerous tasks our Nation asks them to perform.

We must never underestimate the most important asset our military has: the individual. My amendment would ensure that we continue to take care of that asset by providing them every edge, every bit of preparation, and, yes, every bit of training that they require.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairwoman GRANGER for her excellent work on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides a modest increase in the training budget for the Special Operations Command. Like my colleague, I want to make sure that our soldiers are able to deal with any contingency that may confront them.

Our Special Forces deploy to some of the most austere and unique environments in the world. We should do all that we can to ensure their success.

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,300,000)”.

Page 34, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase funding for the Department of Defense health programs by \$1 million to improve coordination between DOD and the VA on research and findings related to toxic exposure to burn pits.

As you know, burn pits were commonly used on U.S. military sites during the Iraq and Afghanistan wars to burn all types of waste from chemicals, paint, and medical and human waste to munitions, petroleum, plastics, and rubber. But, also, as you know, many members of the military, who were exposed to burn pits, are beginning to experience negative health effects from the toxic smoke that they inhaled while on duty.

That is why I am offering this amendment: to increase cross-agency

communication and research so that the Departments can assist those suffering more aggressively and quickly.

On May 7, I met in Vermont with a group of National Guard members, led by Pat Cram, who have been impacted by burn pit exposure. Pat is the wife of Sergeant Major Mike Cram of the Vermont National Guard, who died this past December from prostate cancer, believed to be a direct result of his exposure to burn pits in Iraq and Afghanistan, where he did several tours.

Sergeant Major Cram first deployed to Iraq in 2004 with a group of MPs from the 42nd Infantry Division of the Vermont National Guard. They joined up with the 278th Tennessee National Guard Calvary in Iraq. All 21 soldiers from this group, who deployed together for 18 months, returned home safely, thank God.

But since their safe return, that same group has lost two members from prostate cancer, and another has been treated for it. They believe, and some of the medical professionals believe, that the explanation is that it occurred as a result of exposure to burn pits.

This funding would provide some resources necessary for the VA and Pentagon to work on the issue together effectively so that we can address the direct relationship between burn pits and severe health conditions.

This amendment idea aligns with a June 2018 GAO recommendation that highlighted the need for these Departments to work together to solve this issue. This is reminiscent, potentially, of the Agent Orange situation where, for many years, people were trying to figure out what the cause of the cancers were, and it turned out, after a lot of investigation, that it was directly related to Agent Orange.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GRANGER, who, on occasion, I have traveled with and whose service I have really respected, and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY, for their attention to this issue and willingness to help.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the great group of Members who worked with me on this amendment, including Representatives SOTO, BILIRAKIS, GABBARD, WENSTRUP, RUIZ, and ROSEN.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his concern. This amendment would increase funding in the defense health program account, aiming to improve coordination between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, as both agencies study the effects of toxic exposure to burn pits.

It is important to both Departments to be aware of what the other has done

in this important area of research, therefore, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

□ 1715

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chair, as cochairman with FRANK LOBIONDO in our bipartisan Congressional Lung Cancer Caucus, and FRANK LOBIONDO is a cosponsor of this amendment, I want to begin by expressing our appreciation for making this amendment in order and our additional appreciation for Chairman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for the tremendous work that they do, and the great respect we also have for the ranking member and the chairman of the committee, who I see here today, RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN.

Simply stated, this measure would add \$6 million to lung cancer research under the Defense Health Program.

In so doing, we would be increasing this amount for this important and worthwhile research from \$14 million back to the original \$20 million figure that had been appropriated back in 2009.

In that regard, it is worth noting that were we to factor this for inflation, we would have to be asking for \$23.5 million to match the buying power of \$20 million that this would bring us up to today.

To put my amendment in perspective, a recent study at Walter Reed Medical Center found that treating lung cancer in active military soldiers and veterans every year costs roughly \$564 million, treating our veterans.

According to that same study, our veterans are 75 percent more likely to develop some form of lung cancer than those people who do not serve in our military.

Clearly, with some additional research to find cures and better treatments for this, there are not only enormous dollars to be saved, but more importantly, lives to be saved. That's an important message to our veterans in how we value their service and the risks, the great risks, that they take in serving and in protecting us.

So I hope my colleagues would agree that a modest increase in cancer research funding to the \$20 million figure next year is more than reasonable. It's a sound and necessary investment in public dollars, and an important message to the men and women who serve in our military.

And make no mistake, those extra funds would make an enormous difference in battling lung cancer, which, by the way, takes more lives than all of the other cancers combined. So it is a disease that obviously, as I said, affects our military, but it kills 159,000 people every year.

As many of you know, my daughter, Katherine, was diagnosed with a very advanced stage IV lung cancer some 3 years ago. I thank all of my colleagues for their prayers. I would also be remiss if I didn't say thank you to the many colleagues on both sides of the aisle, not a day goes by but one of you haven't expressed your concern, asked about her well-being, and told me of your continued prayers and hopes for success. And I am here to tell you she is doing well. We have great hope for her in the future, in no small measure due to the prayers, the careful thoughts, and the advances in research, so many of which are coming down the road, in offering her and so many others so much hope.

So I hope we can give many others that same great hope through these additional research dollars.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his amendment. I have no objections and am prepared to accept it.

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. GABBARD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment on the table.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chair, since 9/11, an estimated 3.7 million veterans and servicemembers may have been exposed to burn pits, a common method of disposing of waste during war.

Now, these burn pits include things like human waste, batteries, plastic, damaged equipment all being dumped into a giant pit, doused with jet fuel, and torched.

Much of the waste burned in these pits is toxic and it gets into our troops' eyes, mouth, throat, and lungs. I know this is true, because I was there and I breathed these toxins in every day.

These burn pits aren't put somewhere very far away from where our troops spend their time. They are usually right next to where they live, work, eat, and sleep. Many burn day and night, some burning around the clock, 7 days a week.

Exposure to burn pits can produce serious and potentially life-threatening health effects, including neurological disorders, rare forms of cancer, lung diseases, and more.

Recently, a widow named Jill Wilkins reached out to my office to share her story.

She told me about her husband, United States Air Force Reserves Major Kevin Wilkins, who was an RN and who deployed to Iraq in the summer of 2006.

After prolonged exposure to the toxic chemicals from burn pits, when he came home, he died from a brain tumor in April of 2008. He was only 51 years old, leaving behind his wife, Jill, to take care of their two children by herself.

Now, despite the millions of brave young men and women who have been exposed to burn pits, people like Major Wilkins, they are continuing to be denied their claims and healthcare through the VA.

The DOD and VA have been hesitant to admit that there is sufficient data to quantify this link and to prove the connection between service-related burn pits exposure and the resulting illnesses that some of our troops and veterans are dying from.

What is most troubling about this is that these burn pits are still being used today.

We cannot continue to repeat the dark stains of our past that we have seen in abandoning our Vietnam veterans who have suffered illnesses due to their exposure to Agent Orange.

Even now, I and many other Members of Congress continue to hear from Vietnam veterans about their battles with

the VA to get the benefits and care they need after their exposure to Agent Orange.

Burn pits are the Agent Orange of our generation of veterans. We cannot let this generation go ignored, without the care and services they desperately need.

Our troops didn't hesitate to raise their hands and volunteer to serve this country and put their lives on the line. We cannot turn our backs on them when they return home.

Passing this amendment authorizes \$1 million in burn pits research, which takes an important step towards fulfilling our Nation's promise to take care of our veterans. We have seen some DOD- and VA-funded studies, but we need to do more to get to the point where the VA does the right thing.

We need to pass the Burn Pits Accountability Act that I have introduced with my friend and post-9/11 veteran, Congressman BRIAN MAST.

We know that there is a correlation between burn pit exposures and these illnesses. This amendment takes a small step toward continuing the research, and serves as a shining light to our post-9/11 veterans that they are not alone and that they have not been forgotten. It builds on this progress to ensure that every servicemember and veteran who was exposed to burn pits gets the care and services that they have earned and deserve.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for their attention in raising this important issue and in allowing these amendments to come to the floor.

Our veterans care very much to see that Congress is taking action in the absence of leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman's concerns. The Department is currently funding several research projects related to the potential health effects of open-air burn pits and burn pit exposure, such as pulmonary fibrosis, lung and respiratory issues, and metals toxicology.

I believe this research is important. I don't have any objection to this amendment.

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$8,300,000)".

Page 82, line 20, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for their support of our veterans and for our servicemen and -women. I would also like to thank the cosponsors of this amendment with me, DEBBIE DINGELL of Michigan, DON YOUNG of Alaska, ANN WAGNER of Missouri, DARREN SOTO of Florida, and PETER WELCH of Vermont, for their bipartisan efforts in placing something as important as Fisher House Foundation far above politics.

Fisher House provides 100 percent free lodging for military families, allowing families to stay together while their loved ones are being taken care of in a VA Hospital or military facility.

On any given night, up to 1,000 families are staying in one of the 76 Fisher Houses in districts all across this country, and their need is only growing.

This effort that is the subject of this amendment will help Fisher House build new homes and serve more of our military families.

Fisher House has served over 335,000 families thus far and provided \$407 million in estimated out-of-pocket savings on lodging and transportation to our military families.

Looking ahead, they have eight houses already under construction and have identified 20 more locations in need of their support in their pipeline.

Fisher House is a highly rated nonprofit, having received an A-plus rating from CharityWatch and awarded the Independent Charities Seal of Excellence.

Most importantly, it is a beloved institution throughout our military and veteran communities.

This amendment increases Federal support for Fisher House from \$5 million to \$10 million. It has strong bipartisan support and is a good example of the things we can do if we work together.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this program.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), my friend.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Fisher House Foundation amendment No. 13.

Often, servicemembers must travel hundreds or even thousands of miles for medical care.

For more than 25 years, Fisher Houses have provided a home away from home for the family members of those who are receiving treatment at a military or VA Medical Center. These houses provide stability, convenience, and one less thing to worry about for families as their husbands, wives, sons, or daughters undergo treatment.

Each time I visit the St. Louis Fisher House at Jefferson Barracks, I witness firsthand the dedication of the staff and the volunteers who assist the families of our veterans and servicemembers.

An increase in funds will allow the construction of more Fisher Houses, providing lodging to thousands of military families. We know that a family's love is the best medicine, and good care makes the tough days bearable.

I look forward to casting my vote in support of this important foundation. Together, we can make the lives of those who heroically serve our country just a little bit easier.

Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman for all of her leadership. I thank the gentleman for his cosponsorship and for his yielding me this time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1730

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concern to provide adequate funding for the Fisher House Foundation. The Fisher House Foundation is a nonprofit organization that provides temporary lodging for military family members when confronted with the illness or hospitalization of their servicemember.

The bill already includes \$5 million for the department to grant to the Fisher House Foundation and allows each service to transfer up to \$11 million for Fisher House operations.

I am pleased to accept the amendment to provide additional funding for the Fisher House, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I want them to have one visual in their minds when they think about it. Prior to the Fisher House—which, again, is a public-private partnership; the government money is leveraged with third-party donations—prior to the Fisher House, family members of our veterans who were receiving care often camped out in tents on the grounds of VA hospitals or other military facilities. The Fisher House has solved that problem, which is one of the reasons we should be supporting it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, Amendment No. 14.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our Nation safe.

My amendment, and I appreciate the opportunity in presenting it, is identical to an amendment that I offered and was adopted last year to the Defense Appropriations Act of fiscal year 2018, H.R. 3219. My amendment increases funding for Defense Health Program research and development by \$10 million. These funds will address the question of breast cancer in the United States military.

Mr. Chairman, I am a breast cancer survivor, and the relief of the care and cure is one that you cannot imagine. Just imagine being in the United States military and being diagnosed. These funds are important to increase that research to help our men and women in the United States military.

The American Cancer Society called several strains of breast cancer a particularly aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates. In this instance, it is triple negative breast cancer. That is one that is deadly, more so than many other types, and I have seen close friends, my neighbor, succumb to triple negative breast cancer.

This increased funding should be and, hopefully, will be utilized to do important research in that area. This was evidenced by an article, “Fighting a Different Battle: Breast Cancer and the Military.”

Breast cancer can affect both men and women. The bad news is that breast cancer has been just about as brutal on women in the military as combat. Breast cancer has been just about as difficult to overcome as well. More than 800 women have been wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to the Army Times; 874 military women were diagnosed with breast cancer, just between the years 2000 and 2011. According to the same study, more are expected as it grows.

The good news is that we have been working on it and, therefore, much progress has been made.

The Jackson Lee amendment will allow the additional research on, as I said, devastating triple negative breast cancer. That research is particularly needed since women are joining the armed services in increasing numbers and serving longer, ascending to leadership.

With increased age comes increased risk and the incidence of breast cancer. Military people, in general, and, in some cases, specifically, are at a significantly greater risk for contracting breast cancer, according to Dr. Richard Clapp, a top cancer expert at Boston University who works with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on military breast cancer issues.

Dr. Clapp notes that life in the military can mean exposure to a witch's brew of risk factors directly linked to greater chances of getting breast cancer.

So I ask my colleagues to remember that there are many challenges for those who serve in the United States military. Health is one of them.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, this bill includes \$130 million for the peer-reviewed breast cancer research program. I believe this research is very worthwhile. I do not have any objection to the gentlewoman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, let me thank the chairwoman for acknowledging the importance of the research that is already established. I want to reemphasize that, in the midst of breast cancer research, there will be a focus on many subtypes, if you will, one of them including triple negative breast cancer.

So with the expansion of women in the military, it is extremely important to move forward with this amendment to help ensure that the men and women who risk their lives to protect our freedom can live longer, healthier lives.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is identical to an amendment that I offered and was adopted last year to the Defense Appropriations Act for FY2018 (H.R. 3219).

My amendment increases funding for the Defense Health Program's research and development by \$10 million.

These funds will address the question of breast cancer in the United States military.

As a Member of Congress, a mother, a sister and a spouse, and a breast cancer survivor, I feel a special responsibility to do all I can to ensure every American can win in the fight against all types of breast cancer but especially triple negative breast cancer (TNBC).

Breast cancer can affect both men and women.

The bad news is breast cancer has been just about as brutal on women in the military as combat.

Let me say that sentence again.

Breast cancer has been just about as brutal on women in the military as combat.

More than 800 women have been wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to the Army Times; 874 military women were diagnosed with breast cancer just between 2000 and 2011.

And according to that same study, more are suspected; it grows.

The good news is that we have been working on it, and I want to add my appreciation to the military.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 14, however, will allow for the additional research.

That research is particularly needed since women are joining the Armed Services in increasing numbers and serving longer, ascending to leadership.

Within increased age comes increased risk and incidence of breast cancer.

Not only is breast cancer striking relatively young military women at an alarming rate, but male service members, veterans and their dependents are at risk as well.

With a younger and generally healthier population, those in the military tend to have a lower risk for most cancers than civilians—including significantly lower colorectal, lung and cervical—but breast cancer is a different story.

Military people in general, and in some cases very specifically, are at a significantly greater risk for contracting breast cancer, according to Dr. Richard Clapp, a top cancer expert at Boston University who works at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on military breast cancer issues.

Dr. Clapp notes that life in the military can mean exposure to a witch's brew of risk factors directly linked to greater chances of getting breast cancer.

STATISTICS ON AFRICAN AMERICAN WOMEN AND BREAST CANCER

In 2013, the American Cancer Society Surveillance and Health Services Institute estimated that 27,060 black women would be diagnosed with the illness.

The overall incidence rate of breast cancer is 10 percent lower in African American women than white women.

African American women have a five-year survival rate of 78 percent after diagnosis as compared to 90 percent for white women.

The incidence rate of breast cancer among women under 45 is higher for African American women compared to white women.

Triple Negative Breast Cancer:

Accounts for between 13 percent and 25 percent of all breast cancer in the United States;

Onset is at a younger age;

Is more aggressive; and

Is more likely to metastasize.

Currently, 70 percent of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

African American women are 3 times more likely to develop triple-negative breast cancer than White women.

African-American women have prevalence TNBC of 26 percent vs. 16 percent in non-African-American women.

African-American women are more likely to be diagnosed with larger tumors and more advanced stages of breast cancer.

Currently there is no targeted treatment for TNBC exists.

Some researchers theorize that higher rates of triple negative tumors among young African American Women may be explain, to some degree, the poor prognosis of breast cancers diagnosed.

Not knowing if you have Triple Negative Breast Cancer is the biggest threat to health.

Breast cancers with specific, targeted treatment methods, such as hormone and gene based strains, have higher survival rates than the triple negative subtype, highlighting the need for a targeted treatment.

There continues to be a need for research funding for biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trial designs that will lead to the early detection of TNBC and to the development of multiple targeted therapies to treat this awful disease.

The dedication of funding for research into breast cancer is the right track, we're on the right road.

The expansion of women in the military, makes this area of DoD research particularly important to addressing the real breast cancer risk posed to our women in uniform.

Today women make up around 15 percent of all service personnel in the combined branches of the French military.

Women are 11 percent of the Army forces, 13 percent for the Navy, 21 percent of the Air Force and 50 percent of the Medical Corps.

In 2015, All U.S. military combat positions were opened up to women.

The fighting capacity of the military is linked to the health and wellbeing of women throughout the armed services.

We can offer another tool in the work to keep the women of the military healthy and free of breast cancer through development of test that can detect the disease in its earliest stages and treatments that increase survival rates should breast cancer be contracted.

I urge my colleagues to support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 14.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for shepherding H.R. 6157, the "Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019," to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 14 increases funding for the PTSD by \$5 million.

These funds should be used toward outreach activities targeting hard to reach veterans, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas, who suffer from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Mr. Chair, along with traumatic brain injury, PTSD is the signature wound suffered by the brave men and women fighting in Afghanistan, Iraq, and far off lands to defend the values and freedom we hold dear.

For those of us whose daily existence is not lived in harm's way, it is difficult to imagine the horrific images that American servicemen and

women deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other theaters of war see on a daily basis.

In an instant a suicide bomber, an IED, or an insurgent can obliterate your best friend and right in front of your face.

Yet, you are trained and expected to continue on with the mission, and you do, even though you may not even have reached your 20th birthday.

But there always comes a reckoning. And it usually comes after the stress and trauma of battle is over and you are alone with your thoughts and memories.

And the horror of those desperate and dangerous encounters with the enemy and your own mortality come flooding back.

PTSD was first brought to public attention in relation to war veterans, but it can result from a variety of traumatic incidents, such as torture, being kidnapped or held captive, bombings, or natural disasters such as floods or earthquakes.

People with PTSD may startle easily, become emotionally numb (especially in relation to people with whom they used to be close), lose interest in things they used to enjoy, have trouble feeling affectionate, be irritable, become more aggressive, or even become violent.

They avoid situations that remind them of the original incident, and anniversaries of the incident are often very difficult.

Most people with PTSD repeatedly relive the trauma in their thoughts during the day and in nightmares when they sleep.

These are called flashbacks; a person having a flashback may lose touch with reality and believe that the traumatic incident is happening all over again.

Mr. Chair, the fact of the matter is that most veterans with PTSD also have other psychiatric disorders, which are a consequence of PTSD.

These veterans have co-occurring disorders, which include depression, alcohol and/or drug abuse problems, panic, and/or other anxiety disorders.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 14 recognizes that these soldiers are first and foremost, human, who live their experiences.

Ask a veteran of Vietnam, Iraq, or Afghanistan about the frequency of nightmares they experience, and one will realize that serving in the Armed Forces leaves a lasting impression, whether good or bad.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 14 will help ensure that "no soldier is left behind" by addressing the urgent need for more outreach toward hard to reach veterans suffering from PTSD, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas of our country.

I urge all Members to support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 14.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. CLARK OF MASSACHUSETTS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 32, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$14,364,000) (increased by \$14,364,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this bipartisan amendment, which supports the Pentagon's FY19 budget request for research and development conducted by the Defense Innovation Unit-Experimental, also known as DIUx.

I am grateful to my colleagues, Representatives GALLAGHER of Wisconsin and RUSSELL of Oklahoma, and to my colleague from Massachusetts, Representative TSONGAS, for working with me on this amendment.

American technological innovation is widely renowned as the world's best. Our private-sector innovators are constantly pushing the envelope of the possible, inventing new technologies that revolutionize how people live. However, when it comes to national security, we have a serious problem.

Thousands of our startups have a strong desire to contribute to national security, but over the past two decades, as our cutting-edge innovators have changed the world, government procurement processes have failed to change with them. As a result, in critical areas such as cybersecurity, our top private-sector innovators have no economically viable avenue to pursue government business. The Department of Defense, therefore, has no access to them.

DIUx is the only funding stream in this entire bill that solves this problem. Military services and commanders in the field identify pressing problems that they need solved and bring them to DIUx. DIUx then pairs them with top commanders and top innovators to provide a pilot contract to solve their problems. This has resulted in bids from more than 650 companies in more than 42 States.

Most importantly, DIUx is able to solve these problems, in most instances, in less than 90 days. This is far more flexible, agile, and cost-effective than any other procurement vehicle currently available.

Just one of DIUx's 71 programs now saves the Air Force 400,000 pounds of fuel per day—just one project. That is enough to more than recoup DIUx's entire FY18 appropriation several times over.

If the devastating cuts proposed to this program come to pass, DIUx will lose its critical momentum, capabilities, and talent, jeopardizing the program's future. If we care about protecting our troops, enhancing national

security, and ensuring efficient use of taxpayer funds, I hope we will adopt this amendment, which simply matches the Pentagon's FY19 budget requested by DIUx.

Mr. Chairman, if I may ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL).

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, the Defense Innovation Unit-Experimental is a program that leverages brilliant engineers at places like the Silicon Valley or MIT to invent such amazing things as saline cooling to save the lives of badly wounded soldiers on the battlefield or create improved communications.

In just the last year, the DIUx program saved the United States Air Force hundreds of millions of dollars by replacing a whiteboard management system for managing refueling with an integrated app that saved millions of pounds of fuel each week, totaling hundreds of millions of dollars and, ultimately, billions of savings.

This never would have happened without DIUx. It pays for itself many times over. In fact, we would not have things today like Predator or key anti-missile defense systems without it.

Perhaps some big defense contractors might wish to cut DIUx, but only in Washington would we cut a program that integrates Silicon Valley and MIT engineers, develops products in months instead of decades, and saves billions of dollars. This amendment protects that from happening by restoring the \$14 million in funding, something it already saved in fuel in just a couple of days with the United States Air Force.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, and I thank my colleagues for their work on this bipartisan measure. I urge support.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of innovation and bringing fresh ideas to the department. I support efforts that will deliver promising new technologies and provide our troops with a technological edge to prevail. However, I don't support efforts aimed at building empires under the guise of innovation.

The amendment seeks to reverse a justified reduction made by the committee to the Defense Innovation Unit-Experimental, DIUx. For fiscal year 2019, DIUx proposed to double its budget compared to last year without sufficient justification. This proposed increase was aimed at doubling the size of the program office, along with significant increases for office space and a generous travel budget.

I need to better understand how DIUx will fit into the department's new research and engineering organization and how it will maximize innovation for the warfighter before increasing funds for DIUx.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding.

I, too, share her sentiment that we ought to encourage innovation, but I join her in opposition to the amendment. I am wary of providing funding for an organization within the department that makes commitments of almost \$1 billion without carefully coordinating some of these activities within the department, as happened this past year with a cloud computing contract.

I am also concerned about the fact that the Defense Innovation Unit has found only a way, basically, to fund innovative activities in limited areas of the country; that is, the East Coast and the West Coast, with rarely anything in between.

I also add my concerns that the Defense Innovation Unit relies on Reserve officers to man their organizations when each of the Reserve chiefs have advised us that they cannot fill their own ranks.

So I do agree with the gentlewoman and her opposition, and I appreciate her yielding.

□ 1745

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I support efforts to bring innovation and new capabilities to the warfighter. However, the DIUx unit appears more focused on building its own program office rather than delivering capability.

I do not believe additional funding for DIUx is justified at this time. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 32, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas, the distinguished chair, for her leadership.

The amendment I am offering will support explosive ordnance disposal equipment upgrades and technology enhancements.

When the Department of Defense canceled the EOD/Low Intensity Conflict Program, which formerly developed and delivered capabilities commonly required by each services' EOD tactical units, it was done without transferring this program and the oversight responsibility on EOD research, development, and acquisition to that of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

It is my understanding that DOD's Combating Terrorism Technical Support Office will now absorb this specific mission set within their Improvised Device Defeat and Explosives Countermeasures program. This program is unique in that it supports the United States Government's Interagency Deputies' Technical Support Working Group to combat terrorism by using a whole-government approach. Specifically, the program leverages the intelligence community, the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, Justice, and State, as well as State, local, and Tribal levels of government.

There are about 33,000 annual callouts, approximately 4,500 of which are on DOD military munitions. The Improvised Device Defeat and Explosives Countermeasures program develops or improves operational capabilities to neutralize, render safe, and contain blast fragmentation during these emergency response operations and terrorist incidents involving use of IEDs in the homeland. Furthermore, it produces dual-use capabilities on enhancing lifesaving technologies for military tactical EOD units and those of public safety bomb squads organized at the State, local, and Tribal levels of government.

Therefore, I encourage the Director of the Combating Terrorism Technical Support Office to appropriately prioritize funding toward delivery of these advanced dual-use capabilities in the IED countermeasures program used by military tactical EOD units and public safety bomb squads.

In closing, this program is critical to the safety and security of America's

citizens. Military tactical EOD units and public safety bomb squads deserve the best tools and equipment we can provide so they are able to neutralize, disable, dismantle, render safe, and exploit improvised explosive devices and explosive ordnance both at home and abroad. My amendment will ensure they receive the equipment upgrades and technology enhancements they need.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, improvised explosive devices continue to be used by terrorists against our forces, which is why the bill includes \$150 million for technologies to combat terrorism, including investments to counter improvised explosives. The additional funds will be helpful to develop technologies to help protect our troops.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's dedication to this issue, and I also thank him for his previous service in the Army as an explosive ordnance disposal technician.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 17 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 32, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$50,000,000) (increased by \$50,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order, as well as Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their hard work on this important Defense Appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this bipartisan amendment with my good friends Mr. CORREA, Mr. LIEU, Ms. SHEA-PORTER,

Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Ms. STEFANIK in order to support the DOD Cyber Scholarship Program.

Since 2001, DOD has funded the Information Assurance Scholarship Program, or ASP, in order to boost the Nation's cyber workforce through scholarship and capacity-building grants. Scholarship recipients are required to fulfill a service obligation by working in a cybersecurity position at DOD upon graduation.

This program has been extremely successful, bringing nearly 600 students into the DOD workforce. However, due to budget constraints, the Department reduced funding for the program beginning in 2013 and stopped recruiting new students. Now, this program received \$7.5 million in 2005, its peak funding level, but for FY 2017, it received a mere \$500,000.

The cybersecurity challenges that we face, Mr. Chairman, are growing every day. This scholarship program will help ensure that students are encouraged to pursue degrees in cybersecurity-related fields and that more of them can then work defending our Nation.

Across every industry, across the public and private and nonprofit sectors, qualified cybersecurity professionals are, indeed, in short supply, and the Department of Defense must compete for this very small pool of candidates. These funds will assist in alleviating the challenges that the Department of Defense is experiencing in recruiting and retaining cybersecurity personnel by providing additional opportunities to develop a qualified cyber workforce and expanding awareness at public educational institutions.

Mr. Chairman, in last year's National Defense Authorization Act, we reinvigorated the funding while simultaneously expanding it to include students pursuing associate's degrees so as to tap into a larger candidate pool.

The committee also made in order a similar amendment in last year's appropriations bill to ensure the newly reauthorized expanded program would be appropriately funded. It was passed by the whole House during amendment consideration, and we aim to do the same this year to finally get this critical program back off the ground.

Cybersecurity, Mr. Chairman, is the national security and economic security challenge of the 21st century, and every armed conflict today and in the future will include a battle in this domain. It is incumbent upon Congress to recognize this fact and appropriately support USCYBERCOM and our other cyber defenders. All the policies in the world, though, are meaningless without personnel to execute them, and this amendment makes vital investments in our human capital.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan effort.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendments No. 19 and No. 20 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 32, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 32, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I spoke a little bit earlier on the cyber scholarship program, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I agree that cybersecurity is a very important national security issue. The scholarship program will help in attracting and retaining a cyber workforce. I appreciate the gentleman's dedication to the issue.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her support and her work, along with Ranking Member VISCLOSKY's work on the Defense Appropriations bill, and in particular their support of the Assurance Cyber Scholarship.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) having assumed the chair, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year

ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 970, INSISTING DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE COMPLY WITH REQUESTS AND SUBPOENAS

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-791) on the resolution (H. Res. 971) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 970) insisting that the Department of Justice fully comply with the requests, including subpoenas, of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subpoena issued by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to potential violations of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act by personnel of the Department of Justice and related matters, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 964 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6157.

Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1758

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 115-785 offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) had been disposed of.

**AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF
CONNECTICUT**

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in House Report 115-785.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 75, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment which would increase funding for the Department of Defense’s Sexual Assault Prevention and Response programs.

The men and women of our Armed Forces sacrifice a great deal to serve our country. When they enlist, they do so knowing that they may be sent into violent and dangerous situations to confront an adversary. What they do not sign up for is the violence of being sexually assaulted by one of their own fellow servicemembers.

We need to do better by all those who wear the uniform. I am encouraged that the Department of Defense has established Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program to prevent these crimes from occurring, and to ensure that victims have the resources they need to recover should an incident occur.

But the number of servicewomen and -men who experience sexual assault in the military remains staggering. Last year alone, the Department of Defense received over 6,750 reports of sexual assault involving servicemembers. Meanwhile, DOD estimates that only one in three servicemembers who experience a sexual assault file a report.

Clearly, sexual assault remains a serious issue in the Armed Forces. With over 1 million Active-Duty troops, and over 800,000 serving in the Guard and Reserves at installations all over the world, sexual assault prevention and response programs require our full support and funding. We must provide the best possible care and resources for our servicemembers who are dutifully and honorably serving and defending the United States.

That is why my amendment would increase funding for these worthwhile and vital programs, to ensure that they are there when servicemembers need them.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, sexual assault remains a serious problem in the military and one that we must continue to be addressing. The Department has implemented a number of measures to prevent and reduce sexual assault incidents, prosecute perpetrators, and better respond to victims. Despite this, there is still more to be done.

This bill provides \$318 million, which is \$35 million above the President’s request for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response programs at the service level and at the Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program office.

I agree that this is a critical issue that requires attention at the highest

level. All of the military services must continue to address incidents of sexual assault and make clear that the military has zero tolerance for such behavior.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her support and the support of the committee as well as the Rules Committee in moving forward this important amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 115-785.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the procurement, the deployment, or the research, development, test, and evaluation of a space-based ballistic missile intercept layer.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, my straightforward amendment would prohibit the misguided use of taxpayer dollars to attempt to develop a space-based missile defense intercept layer.

As the Chair knows, the Senate-passed version of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 tasks the Missile Defense Agency with developing such a concept.

Mr. Chairman, we have been here before. The idea of a space-based intercept layer has gone in and out of fashion for the last 30 years, ever since President Reagan called for defending the United States against a massive first strike by developing a Strategic Defense Initiative system, commonly known as Star Wars.

But every time technologically competent outside experts have looked at this space-based concept, they deem it unworkable, impossibly expensive, vulnerable to simple countermeasures, easy for an opponent to destroy, easy to overwhelm with a small number of enemy missiles, or all of the above.

In fact, the former Director of the Missile Defense Agency, Admiral Syring said in 2016, that he had:

Serious concerns about the technical feasibility of interceptors in space, and its long-term affordability.

In order to reach an incoming ballistic missile during the first few minutes of flight, a large number of interceptors must be stationed in low-altitude orbit where they will be very easy for an enemy to destroy.

A report conducted by the American Physical Society in 2003 concluded that in order to ensure full coverage, a fleet of 1,000 or more orbiting satellites would be required to intercept just a single missile.

To put that in perspective, the United States today currently has slightly more than 800 satellites in Earth's orbit, and that includes commercial, scientific, and military satellites.

The National Academy of Sciences estimated that even an austere and limited network of 650 satellites would cost \$300 billion, or roughly 10 times the cost of a ground-based system.

Setting aside the massive cost, a space-based missile defense system has inherent vulnerabilities that greatly limit its effectiveness. Even with thousands of interceptors deployed, only a few would be within range to target an incoming missile, and those could easily be overwhelmed by the launch of several missiles from one location.

And because interceptors must be stationed in low-altitude orbit, they could easily be detected, tracked, and destroyed. It is these limitations that led Admiral Syring to conclude that:

Essential space-based interceptor technologies have been worked on only sporadically over the years and, consequently, are not feasible to procure, to deploy, or operate in the near or midterm.

There is no doubt that a ballistic missile defense, if technologically feasible and economically justifiable, would be an important priority for our national security. So would be the Star Trek warp drive, or the transporter, if they were not technological fantasies.

But as a scientist, and, in fact, the only Ph.D. physicist in the U.S. Congress, I think that we have to listen to the experts and do our homework before investing hundreds of billions of dollars attempting to develop an unworkable system.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me and vote "yes" on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, as noted by Secretary of Defense Mattis:

Space is a contested domain by our strategic competitors just like air, land, and sea.

This dangerous amendment would place our country at a disadvantage with our strategic competitors by limiting the work that can be done to continue our efforts in protecting our

dominance in space, and, further, from protecting our homeland from intercontinental ballistic missiles.

With the significant advances being made today by our adversaries in key areas, such as hypersonic weapons and expanding nuclear weapon proliferation, we must not restrict the Defense Department from pursuing options to deploy directed energy in space or any other capability that would result in the possibility of boost-phase capability that could be deployed from space.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is against even the possibility of investigating and going down this road. House authorizers and appropriators understand the importance of employing a layered missile defense capability, and this dangerous amendment would significantly constrain options for developing critical defensive capabilities in a gap of our current ballistic missile defense system.

A proponent of boost-phase missile defense, General Hyten, the commander of Strategic Command testified this year that:

The day you can actually shoot a missile down over somebody's head and have that thing drop back down on their heads, that will be a good day. Because as soon as you drop it back on their heads, that is the last one they are going to launch, especially if there is something nasty on top of it. I think directed energy brings that to bear, although such weapons do not yet exist in the U.S. arsenal.

Finally, I would also point out that the issue of space-based intercept was debated at length last year, passed with bipartisan support in the House Armed Services Committee, and that the National Defense Authorization Act last year passed with broad bipartisan support on the House floor.

This year, the Senate Armed Services Committee has also provided broad bipartisan support on this critical, technological development area. Now, is not the time to curtail this emerging potential capability.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I spent most of my career as an energy particle physicist and accelerator designer, designing and building complex technical systems. Nothing is less productive as a use of taxpayer money than designing and building a system, attempting to build a system that you know from the outset cannot and will not work.

If there was suddenly a magic new technology, then we can revisit this decision. But the fundamental physics and the fundamental numerology of the attack versus defense balance in this has not changed in the last 30 years as we have examined this issue.

So I think that just because it would be nice if we could magically drop a launch missile back on the enemy's head, if we do not have plausible technology that could accomplish that, doing paper designs of systems that

will not work is a blatant waste of taxpayer money.

Again, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, well, let me just conclude by saying in opposition, if it hasn't been developed yet, you don't know that it doesn't work. We have hundreds or even thousands of bright minds. I appreciate my colleague's credentials, but we have hundreds of scientists and engineers working in the Missile Defense Agency and at the government-sponsored laboratories and in other parts of the defense community in the private sector, and at the Department of Defense in the government sector, and there are possibilities here that are being pursued that have great promise, have great potential.

I think it would just be the height of foolishness to cut it off all right now when there is not even any money being appropriated for this. It is just even the possibility that the gentleman is trying to cut off, when we have potential for something that would be helpful to saving our homeland, and making those who want to rain missiles on us have to suffer the consequences of those missiles coming back down on themselves. So we shouldn't foreclose the possibility and shut the door.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, I think this all comes down to technical feasibility. Whenever you are thinking of how to spend taxpayer money, you must make a judgment call as to what things are just way out there and are not going to happen in our lifetimes, and things which have a realistic chance of working on the time scale that we are planning for.

And when all of the experts that you convene to look at this unanimously say that this system makes no sense, then it makes no sense to spend taxpayer money until we get the breakthroughs that might some day make it possible.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

□ 1815

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Illinois for a colloquy.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

As the only Ph.D. physicist in Congress, I would like to take a moment to highlight the risks of underfunding both nuclear nonproliferation and detection.

When discussing the dangers of nuclear weapons, we often overfocus our attention on missiles and missile defense. Unfortunately, proliferation challenges are changing significantly, and there are, unfortunately, many ways to deliver a nuclear weapon, for example, the smuggling of nuclear radiological materials into the United States through our maritime ports or borders or through the use of commercial and recreational vehicles to deliver waterborne nuclear devices.

We must focus our resources on developing and deploying technologies that will lead to a substantial improvement in our ability to detect, verify, and monitor fissile material and devices. And we must continue to strengthen our workforce at our national laboratories by continuing to recruit the best and the brightest technical experts.

I note that much of this expertise is the same as will be required to ensure complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement of North Korea's nuclear weapons programs and their nuclear weapons.

We can have the most expensive missile defense system in the world, but unless we address these unconventional threats as well, it is simply a false sense of security.

So it is my hope that, by raising these concerns and rebalancing our spending, we will continue to develop new and innovative ideas to detect and monitor the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and materials and, ultimately, make the world a safer place.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and acknowledge his expertise as a fellow member of the Nuclear Security Working Group.

I am grateful that Mr. FOSTER has raised the important subject of nuclear smuggling and for his continued commitment to addressing nuclear security issues. We must be relentless in developing the technologies that will help us identify and counter nuclear smuggling before dangerous materials fall into terrorist hands.

The 2018 Nuclear Posture Review acknowledges the importance of nonproliferation and countering nuclear terrorism. But I do not believe the document is forward-thinking enough when it comes to developing a plan to address future threats. We must continue to invest in research and development of nonproliferation technologies

so we will have the tools that we need to keep our Nation secure in an increasingly complex nuclear environment.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's raising it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 115-785.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure, or to extend or renew a contract to procure, any good or service from Zhongxing Telecommunications Equipment Corporation, ZTE Kangxun Telecommunications Ltd., or Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, ZTE and Huawei Technologies are owned by the Chinese Government. Time and time again, we have seen that these companies, along with many others, abuse and manipulate their placement in the market to attack sensitive American communications, the technology sector as a whole, and our national critical infrastructure.

There is no partisan disagreement on this point. Congress has been briefed many times on Chinese cyber attacks, espionage, and trade secret theft. We all know this is a problem. It is therefore astonishing, Mr. Chairman, that it is still possible that U.S. taxpayer dollars could be used to buy goods and services from these two bad apples.

My amendment would change that. Put simply—and it is very simple, Mr. Chairman—my amendment would prevent funds under this act to procure any goods or services from these two companies. This should be the start of a larger, coordinated effort to harden our defense supply chain, sensitive communications networks, and critical industries and infrastructure from modern threats, whether they come from China or anywhere else.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with my friends and colleagues in both parties in making that a reality, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment reaffirms ex-

isting DOD policy and supports the House NDAA, which also includes this provision.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendment No. 26 and seek time to speak in support.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 1, strike “(CVN 80)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendment No. 26 to provide cost-effective funding for the Navy's fourth Gerald R. Ford-class aircraft carrier, CVN-81.

Let me be clear. Amendment No. 26 does not add any additional funding to the carrier replacement program line for fiscal year 2019. None. Not one dollar. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found amendment No. 26 would not score; it would not change the overall level of budget authority or outlays in the bill in fiscal year 2019. According to the Parliamentarian, this is simply a perfecting amendment to allow for already appropriated funds to be used for both CVN-80 and CVN-81.

I believe it is possible to be both a defense hawk and a fiscal hawk. My amendment supports both positions.

For defense hawks, amendment No. 26 fulfills a critical need for our U.S. Navy. The Navy's most recent force structure assessment identified a need to maintain 12 aircraft carriers to meet combatant commanders' needs and address a growing demand for U.S. presence around the world. However, under the current shipbuilding and ship retirement plans, the Navy would dip below 12 aircraft carriers beginning in 2025 and would atrophy to just 9 aircraft carriers by 2048. This is simply unacceptable.

By procuring an additional aircraft carrier now, we better position the Navy to meet future requirements. By supporting a strong aircraft carrier base, we also show a commitment to the aircraft that operate from the carrier. The F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, the FA-18 E/F Super Hornet, EA-18G Growler, MH-60S Knighthawk helicopter, MH-60R Seahawk helicopter, as well as the E-2C/D Hawkeye aircraft all

require an aircraft carrier to operate in the Navy.

For fiscal hawks, the numbers are clear. A two-ship buy of CVN-80 and CVN-81 saves more than \$1.6 billion in shipbuilder costs when compared to single ship procurements. When government-furnished equipment is included, the total savings are projected to reach \$2.5 billion. Additionally, increasing the build rate encourages the shipbuilder and suppliers to make capital investments that produce production efficiencies and reduce costs for these and future ships in the Ford class.

We already have had great congressional support on this very issue. In December 2017, I led a letter with 131 House signatures to Department of Defense Secretary Mattis in support of this same dual aircraft carrier buy approach. This same provision also was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019. And H.R. 5515, which recently passed the House by an overwhelming bipartisan margin of 351-66 on May 24 of this year, is a signal of what needs to be done.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, but I do not plan to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I would like to use my time to express a note of caution to my colleagues. First, I am on record encouraging the Navy to look into constructing two aircraft carriers simultaneously. I understand the Navy is in the process of evaluating potential savings from a two-carrier buy, and I look forward to seeing that report.

Secondly, I support the Navy's fleet. Whatever the correct number may be in the end, the Navy definitely needs to have more ships to meet its mission. However, the construction of ships is very expensive. Even with the potential savings from a two-carrier buy, the expected cost of those ships would probably exceed \$10 billion apiece. We also have a bulge coming up in the Navy's shipbuilding plan, as construction of the Columbia-class ballistic missile submarine gets underway.

I am not opposed to increasing the Navy's shipbuilding budget in future years, but it needs to be done in a manner that is in step with the industrial base and strategic needs of the whole Department of Defense.

Unfortunately, this body and the other body did not waive the last 2 years of the Budget Control Act. So I remind my colleagues that it is terrific talking about building more ships that we don't have the money for. The fact is, next year, this bill, left uncertain, will have \$71 billion less in it, if the restrictions of the Budget Control Act are not changed.

I also would point out that two of my colleagues, who will very briefly be offering another amendment, are also co-sponsors of an amendment that we will consider in a few minutes that will cut the carrier program this year by \$49.1 million.

I also would emphasize to my colleagues who think we are not doing enough that the committee in the bill that is on the floor today has added \$837,330,000 to the shipbuilding program that was recommended by the administration to be \$21,000,871,437. And we have added two additional warships not requested by the administration.

So to imply somehow that we are weak-kneed and not spending adequately on building ships in this country is simply not true. I certainly support the objectives of my colleagues, and that is to look at an expanding Navy. But we also have to consider where we are from a budgetary standpoint today and not necessarily vote later to cut the carrier program in the same year by \$49.1 million.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to first of all state very clearly that, in my opinion, both the chair and ranking member are strong supporters of our Navy and of a strong national defense, and any push in terms of these amendments is not a criticism of them at all in terms of the great work that they and their staff do putting forward a Defense Appropriations bill.

Again, very quickly, this amendment really just is an opportunity to try to take advantage of the savings that my friend, Mr. WITTMAN, described.

Block buy purchases have been tremendously successful. The last block contract for *Virginia* class, the Block IV, the PEO of submarines, Dave Johnson, was always very proud of the fact that we got 10 submarines for the price of 9 because of using the advantages of bulk purchases, which anyone who shops in Costco knows exactly what he was talking about.

Again, that is a fact, that we achieved great savings by using the block buy purchase mechanism. So I certainly strongly support Mr. WITTMAN's efforts here.

Again, I note that the \$49 million that Mr. VISCLOSKY talked about is in the amendment that is fast approaching, but it was not to cut the program; it was talking to the Navy, a recognition that the change orders that occurred in the last carrier, which is first in class, will not occur to the same extent. So we are really just talking about excess change orders, which, again, as the learning curve improves for carrier production, the Navy and the Armed Services Committee calculated would produce that kind of savings without inefficiencies and without doing harm to the carrier program.

So, again, I thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for supporting

Mr. WITTMAN's amendment. I look forward to working together in terms of both committees to try to achieve the goals of a strong 355-ship Navy.

□ 1830

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana). The gentleman from Virginia has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I will be quick with my closing.

The bottom line is we need these carriers. We need \$26 billion in the shipbuilding budget to reach 355 ships. So the \$21 billion is admirable, but the pathway to get where we need to be of 355 is still out there for us. The challenge that we face ahead must be taken head-on. This is the first step in doing that.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MRS. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,200,000)".

Page 36, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Page 36, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment, which I am proud to colead with Congressman BARR of Kentucky and Congresswoman SINEMA and Congressman BIGGS of Arizona. This amendment would increase funding for the National Guard Counterdrug Program by \$3 million and reduce funding for the operation and maintenance defense-wide account by a corresponding amount.

If the amendment is adopted, the House will provide \$200 million in budget authority for the National Guard Counterdrug Program, which is approximately the amount that the National Guard Bureau indicates it can execute on an annual basis.

My colleagues and I offered this amendment for a simple reason. We believe the National Guard Counterdrug Program is important, that it is effective, and, therefore, that it should continue to receive robust funding. This is

especially true in light of the opioid epidemic that is harming so many communities and tearing apart so many families throughout this country, including in my district in central Florida and in Mr. BARR's district in central and eastern Kentucky.

Under the program, the National Guard Bureau distributes the money it receives from Congress to the National Guards in the States and the territories using a funding allocation model that examines the nature and scope of the drug problem in each jurisdiction. With this funding, National Guards may provide many different forms of authorized assistance to law enforcement agencies and community-based organizations, including analytical, reconnaissance, and training support.

This program is effective because it is targeted and tailored. Each State uses its funding in a way that reflects the drug interdiction priorities of its Governors, the capability of its National Guard, and the needs of its law enforcement partners at the Federal, State, and local levels.

For example, the Florida National Guard receives about \$10 million a year under this program, which it uses to reduce the supply of and demand for illegal drugs in the State. Since 2014, support provided by the Florida National Guard has been instrumental in over 2,000 arrests and the seizure of nearly \$14 billion in illicit drugs, property, and cash. National Guards in other States have their own success stories as well.

In conclusion, I hope my colleagues will support this bipartisan amendment, which is vital to our Nation's effort to disrupt and dismantle drug trafficking organizations and to protect our communities and our children from drug-related violence.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, this amendment increases funding for the National Guard's Counterdrug Program. We are very supportive of the counterdrug program. The bill in front of us increases funding at the same level that passed the House last year.

That being said, I understand this program is very important to many Members, and I support this amendment to provide a modest increase.

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

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's support for this amendment, and I would just reiterate my view that the National Guard Counterdrug Program is important. I would respectfully ask my colleagues to support this amendment, which will help ensure this program is fairly funded.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY). The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands amendment No. 28 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in House Report 115-785.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 22, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,500,000)".

Page 24, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$49,100,000)".

Page 24, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,001,435,000)".

Page 24, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$246,510,000)".

Page 24, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

Page 24, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$685,825,000)".

Page 26, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$386,325,000)".

Page 27, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$30,900,000)".

Page 29, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$73,000,000)".

Page 32, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$26,100,000)".

Page 32, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$159,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a bipartisan, straightforward amendment that funds long-lead materials to boost construction of Virginia-class submarines to three per year, starting in 2022.

This amendment comes in response to the adamant, persistent warnings of our combatant commanders in testimony before Congress—Admiral Harris of the Pacific Command and General Scaparrotti of the European Command—that submarines are their number one unfilled priority.

This appropriations bill, unlike the NDAA, which passed 351-66, unfortunately, does not give the Navy the tools to answer that demand signal.

Here is the reality: Today, the fleet has 52 subs. The two per-year build rate in this bill will result in a drop to 42 submarines in 2028, as shown on this chart from official numbers straight from the Navy, because subs are aging out faster than the two-per-year build rate can replace.

My amendment does answer the demand signal of the COCOMs, raising the build rate to three per year at the earliest possible window, based on Navy analysis of industrial base capacity that was submitted to Congress last February.

Mr. Chairman, right now, in real time, the next 5-year block contract is being negotiated, which will determine the Nation's submarine construction until 2023. If this amendment fails, Members should be crystal clear that our Nation cannot get that time back to magically add subs later. It takes 5 years to build an attack sub, and this year's bill coincides with block negotiations in a make-or-break moment.

The offsets to pay for this amendment were part of the NDAA that a bipartisan majority of us just passed on May 24 and do not—I repeat, do not—cut a single ship or plane from the base bill, despite some of the claims that are flying around regarding this amendment.

In particular, a last-minute DOD letter out yesterday about out-year impacts is pure speculation. We will talk about this more later.

I am proud to say that my amendment is supported by some of America's most distinguished Navy officers, the last two CNOs, Admirals Roughead and Greenert; the former Fleet Forces Commander, Admiral Robert Natter; and the former Commander of Sub Forces, Admiral Michael Connor; as well as the Navy League and the metal trades of the AFL-CIO.

Mr. Chairman, they understood the urgency expressed by other COCOMs. Now the question is whether Congress will rise to the challenge they threw down.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, it really is this compelling argument: Are we, as a nation, willing to make the commitment to ensure our future national security?

Here is the deal: We are losing submarines at a breakneck pace because we are not building them fast enough to replace the ones that are retiring.

In 2020, the Chinese—just the Chinese—will have 70 submarines. They are building them at a rate of six per year. So, by 2029, when we have 42, they will have 124.

Are we willing to do that as a nation? Are we willing to take that risk? Are we willing to look at our children and grandchildren and tell them that, when we had a chance to do something, we didn't do it?

At 5:48 today, the United States Naval Institute news released an article that says: "Congress Faces Last Chance to Add 2 Virginia-Class Attack Subs to the Next Block Buy." Last chance.

Here is our chance to do what is right for the Nation. Here is our chance to do what is right for national security. Here is our chance to look at our children and grandchildren and tell them we did the right thing. We saw what was coming and we stood strong, and we built the submarines necessary to defend this Nation.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support just as strongly as my friend from Virginia in support of the amendment from my good friend from Connecticut.

Mr. Chairman, we have a serious strategic issue with respect to submarines. This amendment would give the Navy the option—just an option, Mr. Chairman, not a requirement—to procure submarines at a faster rate than it is currently planning right now.

As we face bigger threats from China, from Russia, and in force projection in general, we need to look at all options, all especially when we are routinely briefed, as we all are on the Armed Services Committee, on the strategic deficiencies that we find right now.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out and make sure everyone knows I have zero shipyards in Arizona. We do not build any ships in Arizona. We are landlocked.

I support this amendment not just because I am a marine and because I am a patron; I think it is in the best interests of our country and national defense.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

We have an opportunity that doesn't come around all that often, thank God. Apparently, there are people who think this isn't important to our national defense.

I went up to an electric boat just 2 months ago. This is the most complicated machine ever designed, ever built in the history of the world. You don't turn this on and off like a spigot of water.

This is about saving our country. You heard the chairman talk about how we are falling behind as a country. How can we sit by and let this go? We must come together. We have to build this now or we are putting our country at risk.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Connecticut has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend both Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. WITTMAN for their tireless effort on the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

As they have already stated, our Navy is being squeezed and desperately needs more ships, especially submarines. Numerous civilian and military officials, including Secretary Mattis, have testified about the need for these submarines.

The goal of this amendment to ensure the Navy has the necessary resources in 2019 so that they can officially pursue and negotiate the multiyear contract is extremely important.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut and my colleague from Virginia for their hard work.

Mr. Chair, following are my remarks in their entirety:

I would like to commend both Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. WITTMAN for their tireless work on the Seapower Subcommittee on the House Armed Services Committee supporting our nation's Navy and our shipbuilding industrial base. As I have the honor of representing Newport News, Virginia, home to thousands of shipbuilders, I appreciate their work and commitment to this issue.

As Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. WITTMAN have already stated, our Navy is being squeezed and desperately needs more ships, especially Virginia-class attack submarines. Numerous civilian and military officials, including Defense Secretary Mattis, have testified before Congress that we need more submarines. And that's the goal of this amendment—to ensure that the Navy has the necessary resources in FY2019 that they would need in order to efficiently pursue and negotiate the next multiyear block contract in the early 2020.

Specifically, this amendment provides funding for a submarine reactor, industrial base support and other critical items. The amendment does not bind Congress or the Navy into any specific course of action. If the Navy opts not to pursue the option to purchase additional submarines, that reactor and other material purchases with these funds will be absorbed into submarines that the Navy has already contracted to buy.

Our shipbuilding industrial base is critical to our national security. Making these investments today will both save money for our Navy and provide more certainty for our shipbuilders. This amendment is supported by unions, the Navy League, and retired flag officers.

Mr. Chair, we have heard warnings for years that our submarine fleet is at risk of dropping to levels that would make it incredibly difficult for the Navy to achieve its mission. This amendment guards against that from becoming a reality.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that Congress can preserve the option for the Navy to build as many submarines as possible, and as cost-effective as possible, in the next five-year block contract.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters from Admiral Greenert, Admiral Roughead, and the two most recent CNOs, Admiral Natter and Vice Admiral Connor.

JUNE 2018.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
Chairman, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member, House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. JOE COURTNEY,
Ranking Member, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN THORNBERRY AND WITTMAN, AND RANKING MEMBERS SMITH AND COURTNEY, Thank you for your leadership in passing another timely and insightful NDAA for 2019. In my opinion your respective committees have led the way in Congress in proposing strategic and coherent defense related legislation.

I want to pass along my belief in the importance of this bill's provision regarding the expansion of our undersea capabilities—particularly the submarine fleet.

During my 40-year career, including my tenure as CNO, our Navy "owned" the Undersea domain. Navy's superiority in the undersea domain has been unchallenged, predominantly due to the excellence of the submarine force. This is no longer assured. Real threats are emerging—fast.

Our industrial base builds the finest submarines in the world. Combatant Commanders consistently request a robust submarine presence. And, the demand for submarine presence has grown even more since I retired in 2015. Navy's recent Force Structure Assessment, embraced by the Executive and Legislative Branches, validates a need for 66 submarines. The need is real and urgent. However, without near term additional legislative action our fleet is on track to reach 41 attack submarines by 2029. This will leave our future civilian and military leaders woefully short of a key platform to meet emerging challenges in the undersea (and surface) domain.

The House 2019 NDAA recognized that sustaining an SSN build rate of two-per-year would not arrest, and reverse, the decline in the undersea fleet. Authorizing additional resources for increased SSN production, specifically preserving the option to use available industrial capacity in 2022 and 2023 to reach a three-per-year build rate, is exactly the kind of thoughtful and tangible legislative action, and messaging, we need. Again, your respective committees are leading the way. As Congress continues its work on defense authorization and appropriation in the near term, I would urge your colleagues to see the opportunity and flexibility inherent in this option—and support the plan laid out in the 2019 NDAA passed by the House.

Our undersea superiority is being challenged. The recent acknowledged loss of intellectual property (Sea Dragon) is a recent example. I urge the Congress to embrace this unique opportunity presented by the House 2019 NDAA. Our security depends on this sort of bold and innovative action.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN W. GREENERT,
Admiral, USN (Retired).

JUNE 17, 2018.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member, House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
Chairman, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

Hon. JOE COURTNEY,
Ranking Member, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN THORNBERRY AND WITTMAN AND RANKING MEMBERS SMITH AND COURTNEY: I appreciate your Committee's and Subcommittee's support of the U.S. Navy reflected in your markup of the 2019 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA).

The National Security Strategy, National Defense Strategy and your NDAA address and articulate the realities of once again confronting peer adversaries. In that regard, our undersea dominance will be challenged aggressively and simultaneously in several geographic regions. Whoever controls the undersea domain and sea lanes vital to us and our allies will have the upper hand in crisis and conflict history bears that out and our time is no different. Investments in capabilities (sensors, communications, weapons and quiet propulsion, etc.) will matter greatly but submarine capacity, the number of submarines we have to dominate in dispersed geographic areas, is vital. In confronting peer

adversaries at sea we must acknowledge and anticipate high-end, complex maritime warfare will result in some loss of capital assets which cannot be replaced quickly. Our submarines, because of their lethality, will be aggressively hunted and we must anticipate losses in that force. The Navy's recent Force Structure Assessment (FSA) validates the need for 66 attack submarines (I believe that number should be 72) yet we are on a path to 41 in 2029. The House 2019 NDAA recognizes this shortfall and thoughtfully and prudently seeks to enable increasing the Virginia Class submarine build rate to three ships per year in 2022 and 2023 by authorizing expenditures to that end.

Our peer adversaries are investing in research, technology and capacity. This is not what we think they will do, it is what they are doing. Our submarines and the industrial base that produces them are superior but we will need more of them and it in the coming years. We must continue to maintain our dominance and I urge your committee and your colleagues in the Senate and those on the House and Senate Appropriation Committees to definitively provide for at least three submarines in fiscal years 2022 and 2023. The gap in submarine capacity between the U.S. and our peer competitors is growing to our disadvantage. Proactive investments must be made now to arrest that growing disparity in submarine force structure and avoid the consequences of being, for the first time in decades, at a disadvantage under the sea.

Sincerely,

GARY ROUGHEAD,
Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired).

JUNE 12, 2018.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman,
House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
Chairman, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member,
House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. JOE COURTNEY,
Ranking Member, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN THORNBERRY AND WITTMAN, AND RANKING MEMBERS SMITH AND COURTNEY: I am Robert J. Natter, Admiral, US Navy Retired. I am submitting to you my personal views and strong endorsement in support of one particular 2019 NDAA provision regarding our nation's submarine fleet. Firstly, I want you to know that I am not a submariner (I was a surface warfare officer); I am not a constituent; I do not live in a State that builds our nation's submarines; and I do not consult for or represent in any way our two major submarine building shipyards.

I do address this important issue from my perspective as a former Seventh Fleet Commander dealing with, among other challenges, North Korea, China, Freedom of Navigation operations around Taiwan and in Southeast and East Asia waters, and the readiness and combat planning associated with US Navy forces throughout Asia and Indian Ocean waters. I was also Commander of US Fleet Forces Command for three years and in that capacity was responsible for training, equipping and deploying all US-based Navy forces in response to national tasking.

Since I left the service, threats to our nation and our potential adversaries' capabilities have increased significantly. In the meantime our forces, while improving technologically, have diminished in numbers while being tasked at a level not seen since Cold War days. The Navy's recent Force

Structure Assessment clearly validates the need for increased ship and aircraft numbers to meet our defense needs. It also clearly validated the need for a MINIMUM of 66 attack submarines (SSNs). Having said that, we are now on a dangerous build slope of having only 41 SSNs by 2029. The House 2019 NDAA agreed that the current build rate of two submarines per year would not reverse the decline of our undersea fleet.

Authorizing additional dollars for increased SSN production to reach a three-per-year build rate addresses our national security disadvantage while reducing the unit cost of these valuable assets. As you and your Committees work with the Appropriators I encourage all your fellow members to embrace and support the build plan called for in the 2019 House NDAA with its increased build rate for our SSN fleet. In my view, if there is sufficient funding for only one more weapon or ship system, that ship should be an SSN. This is due to its inherent survivability, flexibility (anywhere on the globe) and effectiveness against the highest end threats.

I urge you and your fellow Congressional leaders to convince your colleagues that this provision is necessary, cost effective, and the right thing to do for our country. Thank you for your continuing service to our nation and strong leadership in Congress on behalf of our defense needs.

Most sincerely,

ROBERT J. NATTER,
Admiral, US Navy Retired.

JUNE 12, 2018.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman,
House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
Chairman, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member,
House Armed Services Committee.

Hon. JOE COURTNEY,
Ranking Member, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN THORNBERRY AND WITTMAN, AND RANKING MEMBERS SMITH AND COURTNEY: Thank you for passing the National Defense Authorization bill for FY2019 out of the House, especially the bill's provisions relating to the needed expansion of our undersea fleet.

Submarines are critically important to national security. During my time as Commander of the Submarine Force from 2012 to 2015, I struggled to pace the growing undersea needs of combatant commanders around the world. Many high priority missions can only be accomplished by submarines because peer competitors improved their anti-access technology and long-range strike capability. Submarine demand continues to grow. The most recent force structure assessment that increased the attack submarine requirement from 48 to 66.

Without additional action, our undersea fleet will drop to 41 attack submarines in 2029. This reduced fleet size will leave our civilian leaders and military commanders without the tools they need to keep ahead of changing threats and challenges around the globe. Mitigating this decline in the undersea fleet should be a top priority for the Navy, the Congress, and our nation.

The 2019 NDAA as passed by the House last month recognizes that simply sustaining the two-a-year production rate of Virginia-class submarines will not arrest the decline in our undersea fleet. By authorizing additional resources for increase submarine production, the bill preserves the option for utilizing available capacity in 2022 and 2023 to achieve a three-submarine build rate in those years.

This will reduce the looming shortfall we face in the coming decade and help alleviate the mis-match in submarine demand and resources.

As Congress continues its work on the defense authorization and funding measures in the weeks ahead, I would urge your colleagues to support the plan you have laid out in the 2019 NDAA passed by the House. At a time when our nation's leading edge in the undersea domain is being challenged by competitors around the world, this is an opportunity that we cannot afford to miss.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. CONNOR,
Vice Admiral (ret), U.S. Navy.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, again, I want to thank Mr. VISCLOSKY and Ms. GRANGER for the courtesy and, again, having parity in terms of the time. I realize this is an extraordinary situation. They have a lot of folks who want to take the opposite position, but this is a really good comity in terms of the field.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank the ranking member for his work on this Defense Appropriations bill as well as Congresswoman GRANGER. In particular, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. COURTNEY, for his tireless work as the ranking member of the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee and Mr. WITTMAN for his tireless work.

Our submarines are the true unsung heroes of our naval fleet, and I know from firsthand experience because much of the critical fabrication work of these amazing submarines is done by my constituents in my home State of Rhode Island.

Admirals continuously tell us that they cannot get enough submarines, which are desperately needed across the globe to protect the interests of the United States. In fact, they are only able to meet some 60 or 65 percent of the demands of the requests of the combatant commanders for the use of these submarines.

Despite this urgent need, the number in our fleet is actually dropping. By 2028, it has been reported the number of submarines will drop from 52 to 42. So how can we support this near 20 percent drop when we have the ability to do something about it?

Thankfully, there is a plan to close at least some of this gap by procuring additional submarines in 2022 and 2023. But we can't increase our sub production by 50 percent on a dime. We need to make investments today if we are to be in a position to help reduce the bottling out of our sub fleet.

The hardworking employees of our defense industrial base need to build additional capacity now. We need to act immediately if we are going to be in a position to provide more submarine reactors in the out-years.

□ 1845

This amendment will ensure that we have the flexibility going forward. That is why we included similar language in this year's National Defense Authorization Act, which overwhelmingly passed this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency is particularly evident because our adversaries are not standing still. DOD has estimated that China will have an estimated between 69 and 78 submarines in 2020, and the CSBA has estimated that they will have between 80 and 100 submarines somewhere between 2022 and the 2030 time frame. We cannot, in good conscience, ignore the startling growth of this adversarial fleet.

Mr. Chair, subs not only deter our adversaries, but they also build up our allies and ensure a more prosperous, secure world. Funding our Virginia-class and Columbia-class programs must remain an absolute priority. Anything less is an affront to our national security.

This amendment continues our practice of robust investment in our submarine fleet, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, may I ask the Chair how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, having been pretty close to this issue over the last 12 years, I would like to add just a little bit of perspective in terms of this initiative which, again, started at the Seapower Subcommittee.

The last two times block contracts were being negotiated was in 2007 and in 2012. In both instances, the Congress plussed up the budget for submarine construction exactly the same way we are doing it in this amendment: by funding long-lead materials; advanced procurement; purchase of a reactor, which will be built in Ohio, by the way. That gave the Navy the tools to increase their block buy.

It was done, incidentally, over the objection of the Department of Defense. I was there with Mr. Murtha and Mr. YOUNG who, again, decided to override that objection at the time. That is when we went from one-sub-a-year to two-subs-a-year production.

In 2012 we had a similar situation where the White House, the Obama administration, only requested nine subs in the next block contract, the block 4. Again, the two committees working together boosted that block authority in

appropriations to get to 10 a year. Again, that was over the objections of the Department of Defense.

I realize we are going to hear a lot from my colleagues, my good friends, about Mr. Shanahan's letter that objects to my amendment. I would just say that that is not the first time we have heard that. Luckily, we have leadership in Congress which withstood those arguments. Otherwise, we would be in a worse predicament than we are today.

Again, follow past precedent. The 23 bipartisan amendment cosponsors and I strongly urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank both the chair and the ranking member for the time they have allotted.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, this amendment increases funding for the Virginia-class submarine program by \$1 billion, at the expense of other critical Navy and Air Force programs.

The Department of Defense, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Air Force, and the National Coast Guard Association of the United States all oppose this amendment.

In fact, the Deputy Secretary of Defense sent a letter detailing the harmful effects this amendment has on multiple critical National Defense Strategy programs. His quote: "disrupt multiple critical National Defense Strategy programs."

These are must-have programs, like the DDG 51 guided-missile destroyer, the *Nimitz*-class aircraft carrier, the Global Hawk, and the TAO fleet oiler, just to name a few.

I have also received a letter from the National Guard Association opposing this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD the letters I received from the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the National Guard Association.

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, DC, June 26, 2018.

Hon. KAY GRANGER,

Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRWOMAN: The Department of Defense (DoD) objects to the proposed amendment by Representatives Courtney and Wittman that cuts over \$1 billion from the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 President's Budget. The FY 2019 cuts disrupt multiple critical National Defense Strategy (NDS) programs, including the carrier program and Air Force research and procurement. Combined with the out-year cost of finishing the incrementally funded submarines, the Department would be required to cut over \$6 billion from multiple programs such as reducing, the buys of Arleigh Burke-class destroyers, oilers and fast frigates.

The FY 2019 President's Budget request supports a robust, balanced shipbuilding program, providing \$23.7 billion for ten combat ships and eight support ships, including, two Virginia-class submarines. DoD is com-

mitted to growing the size of the Navy, investing over \$20 billion per year across the Future Years Defense Program. Consistent with the NDS, DODs request balances ship procurement with readiness and other systems to be a more lethal joint force and meet future capabilities.

The Virginia-class submarine provides crucial capabilities to the joint warfight. The current Navy fleet faces known shortfalls in attack submarine inventory in future years. However, in the FY 2019 President's Budget we balanced the investment in this capability against other critical capabilities in areas such as space and cyber, and in emerging areas such as autonomy and artificial intelligence.

The Department appreciates Congressional support for growing the Navy's fleet and ensuring robust future capabilities. Working together we will find solutions that make us stronger and safer.

PATRICK M. SHANAHAN.

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF

THE UNITED STATES, INC.,

Washington, DC, June 27, 2018.

Hon. KAY GRANGER,

Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRWOMAN: On behalf of the 45,000 members of the National Guard Association of the United States (NGAUS), I write today to express our opposition to the proposed amendment by Representatives Courtney and Wittman which provides funding for long lead time materials to construct additional Virginia-class submarines in FY 2022 and FY 2023.

We share the concerns of the Department of Defense as outlined in their June 26th letter of objection. Primarily, our concern centers on the fact that while programmatic adjustments are identified for the beginning of the program, this change will create an unfunded liability across the multi-year procurement cycle. As you know, the National Guard is often supplemented with Congressional assistance from your committee and I worry that creating such a large additional requirement will unduly force cuts in other critical defense funding over the next several years.

I thank you and your staff for your efforts in writing this expansive and important piece of national security legislation. Thank you, as always, for your continued support of the men and women of the National Guard. My staff and I stand by to assist in any way, and I look forward to continuing our great work together.

Sincerely,

J. ROY ROBINSON,

Brigadier General (Ret.),

President, NGAUS.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, not only does this amendment cut \$1 billion from vital programs in FY19; it will leave future Congresses with at least a \$6 billion shortfall. That is not the appropriate way to spend our taxpayers' dollars.

The Navy is not committed to funding these two additional submarines in the future. In fact, the Statement of Administrative Policy on the House-passed NDAA specifically objects to adding two additional submarines above what is currently in the President's budget.

This amendment takes \$346 million that has been set aside for the reactor core for the last *Nimitz*-class carrier refueling overhaul. Delaying this procurement for yet another year hurts

this program and creates serious production gaps. This will directly impact the ability of the manufacturer to provide *Columbia*-class core reactors in a timely manner, and it introduces risk to the schedule for the *Columbia*-class submarine program. That is unacceptable.

The amendment takes \$315 million from other shipbuilding programs, funds that will have to be repaid in future years. It takes more than \$245 million from the DDG 51 guided-missile destroyer program, a critical missile-defense-capable ship that is deployed throughout the world.

This amendment is asking Congress to fund \$1 billion now but create a bill for the future, a bill that will not be paid due to the imminent threat of the return of sequestration.

Some Members have asked if we can just fix this amendment in conference. Let me be very clear on that point. The answer is no. We will not be able to fix the damage this amendment causes in conference. Should this amendment pass, all cuts will be included in the conference report.

I received a letter today from Representative COURTNEY and Representative WITTMAN asking me to reconsider my position on their amendment. Their letter says that this amendment doesn't lock the Congress or Department into any course of action. That is not true.

Who will pay for these subs, and where will they find the money? Cutting \$1 billion out of critically important programs so the Navy can have options in future negotiations of additional submarines is also irresponsible, especially when the Navy has neither requested nor budgeted them.

Since when is it acceptable to give \$1 billion to someone so they can have options?

Their letter also claims they have not heard of any concerns about the proposed first-year offsets. This is not true. In May of this year, the Navy warned that any reductions to the DDG 51 destroyer program will affect the ability of the Navy to achieve any—any—multiyear procurement savings.

Mr. Chair, I will continue to oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I would emphasize that I am strongly opposed to this amendment and join with the chairwoman.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, with whom I feel very privileged to work, for allowing me this time. I rise tonight in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chair, first I want to say, I have the utmost respect for the many sponsors of this amendment, and particularly Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. COURTNEY. They have shown tremendous bipartisan support and leadership in their tireless support of the Navy. They are excellent in their roles on their committees, and I consider them both great colleagues and friends.

However, this amendment is the wrong way to support our Navy. The amendment would cut \$1 billion in funding from a variety of extremely important Navy and Air Force programs to fund advanced procurement for two *Virginia*-class submarines.

While they have made an excellent case about how important strategically those submarines are—and I agree with them on that—the problem is that one of them will be the DDG 51 program, which is supported at Bath Iron Works.

I am proud to be from Maine and to have Bath Iron Works and their excellent workforce in my district. The men and women of Bath Iron Works have been proving the adage “Bath Built is Best Built” for decades, and I oppose any efforts to cut from the DDG 51 program.

My colleagues have said that this amendment is funded by potential multiyear procurement savings in future years in the targeted the programs and, therefore, we should take that funding from these programs now. But the rationale ignores critical military and defense needs and the budgets that have been agreed upon.

The amendment will abandon several agreed-upon key national defense priorities, including increasing the ships in our Navy, a critical priority. Ships that I am proud to say are being manufactured, designed, and engineered by many hardworking men and women in my district.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which would add \$1 billion in advanced procurement for two additional *Virginia*-class submarines in FY 2022/23.

The Navy has a substantial plan for submarines. It achieves the mission of a 355-ship Navy by 2050 and does it in a way that is fiscally responsible and provides for stability of the industrial base.

In a letter from the Secretary of the Navy to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, the Secretary states: “The FY 2019 President’s budget provides sufficient funding to procure the ships included in the FY19-FY23 Future Years Defense Program.”

An advanced procurement amendment of \$1 billion in FY19 and, by the way, an additional \$6 billion tail, would take from much-needed programs that have already been considered by the committee. Additionally, it would jeopardize the future programs and assume risk in other areas.

Mr. Chair, I certainly urge a “no” vote on this, and I will remind my Members, as my friend from Indiana mentioned, we have a cliff coming in 2020. Making a commitment to spend an additional \$7 billion, which we don't have, is not a good idea. We ought to be working on trying to resolve that cliff issue.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, the chairwoman, the ranking member, and I wholly support the U.S. Navy and, also, the Navy's plan to get to the 355-ship number.

This bill already supports the purchase of 12 new ships, including two new *Virginia*-class attack submarines. However, this amendment for an additional two more *Virginia*-class subs will wind up cutting, as you heard, much-needed money from other vital programs. The Department of Defense estimates that it would cut \$7 billion from other programs over the next 5 years, by the way, impacting military readiness and other vital equipment procurement.

So, again, while we must obviously pursue an aggressive shipbuilding program, it must be balanced. The *Virginia*-class sub is absolutely a critical national security capability, but we do not want to sacrifice other equally critical capabilities while we do that.

Mr. Chair, I would respectfully urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Chair, I would again emphasize, first of all, that the committee recognizes the needs of the United States Navy, and in the underlying legislation we have increased—increased—the administration's request.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, we have increased the underlying budget request by \$837 million, and we have added two ships.

The best description for the amendment before us is shortsighted cannibalism. It eats other important Navy and Air Force programs in 2019 to feed the *Virginia*-class submarine. In doing so, it creates a myriad of problems in the out years.

The chairwoman mentioned a number of the programs that were cut in this proposal. I mentioned one in a previous amendment. I would emphasize that some of the gross numbers that have been mentioned include a cut of \$10.5 million from weapons procurement from the United States Navy. It does, I emphasize, cut from carriers \$49.1 million. It takes \$20 million from fleet oilers. It takes \$26.1 million from our research and development from the Navy and \$262.9 million from the Air Force.

This is not new money. This is not free money. We are taking money from programs that need it in 2019.

Mr. Chair, I would also point out that Mr. COURTNEY mentioned two letters that were referenced by the chairwoman. I would also reference two other letters. The suggestion was made that we hear from the administration all of the time.

□ 1900

Well, Chairman MCCAIN, in the Senate, on May 30, 2017, heard from Admiral Richardson relative to the Navy's unfunded priority list for fiscal year 2018. Admiral Richardson, who is Chief of Naval Operations, mentioned 38 priority items for the United States Navy. It did not include this item. It included a request for an additional \$4,796,000,000. It didn't include this item.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter that was sent to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN on February 22 of this year from Admiral Richardson for the Navy's unfunded priority list for this year, 2019. It includes 25 items. I have been scanning this with my bifocals, looking for this item of importance to the United States Navy, and I have not been able to find it in their request for an additional \$1,502,270,000.

The sponsors' claim that this gives the Navy the option to construct two additional *Virginia*-class submarines during the next 5-year block contract, cutting \$1 billion for useful programs this year, to give the Navy an option to do something in 4 years, does not make a bit of sense to me.

The sponsors say that this amendment sets the Navy up well for a multiyear procurement agreement, and I might not be able to argue that, in particular. However, in their quest to set that up, they are, in fact, damaging the ability of the United States Navy to set up a multiyear procurement program for the DDG-51 program.

Mr. Chairman, for all of these reasons, I am strongly opposed to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I urge the rejection of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut will be postponed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, earlier in this debate, we thanked all the members of the staff who made this great bill a reality through their good efforts: the professional staff, associate staff, and all those who work in our personal offices. Again, I would like to do that on all of our behalf.

Mr. Chairman, I especially thank Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their leadership, and the involvement of all those on the floor in the production of this bill. But, at this time, I would like to offer special recognition to one in particular: the late Stephen Sepp, the Appropriations Committee's resident budget expert.

Sepp, as he was known by all, died earlier this month, but he left his mark on this bill and on our committee. His funeral was held today at St. Peter's Catholic Church, in Olney, Maryland, and attended by hundreds of Members and his friends from Capitol Hill and the appropriations family.

Among many things, Sepp was the caretaker of the all-important 302(b) sub-allocations. Through his careful work from his desk in the Capitol, upstairs here, and from home, in the final months of his illness, he ensured that the Congress provided adequate funding—may I say well over \$1 trillion—not just for the Department of Defense, but for all 12 Appropriations bills.

This, of course, required a deep understanding of the policy and budgetary needs of each and every aspect of these bills, and a base of knowledge and situational awareness of all the various political factors at play. He expertly maneuvered this huge responsibility with skill, savvy, and an immense amount of poise.

Sepp embodied strength, facing both professional and personal challenges equally with grace and fortitude. In short, he made a difference in the lives of all he touched—literally millions—as well as the lives of Americans in every part of the country.

We extend our love to his wife, Diem; his two children; and family. We will always remember him.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to follow the chairman's remarks, and associate myself with his remarks relative to the staffer who has been lost.

The chairwoman was kind enough in the general debate to mention the staff and the Members who have been so instrumental in this work product, and I would be remiss if I did not conclude by again thanking the full committee chairman, as well as Mrs. LOWEY.

I can't thank Chairwoman GRANGER enough. This has just been a pleasant and productive experience, and I appreciate her leadership very much. I ap-

preciate the work of all of the members of the subcommittee, as well as all of our staff. That includes our clerks, Jennifer Miller and Rebecca Leggieri, as well as Walter Hearne, Brooke Boyer, B.G. Wright, Allison Deters, Collin Lee, Matthew Bower, Jackie Ripke, Hayden Milberg, Bill Adkins, Sherry Young, Barry Walker, Jennifer Chartrand, Chris Bigelow, Johnnie Kaberle, Jonathan Fay, Joe DeVoght, and Christie Cunningham. I can't thank them enough.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WITTMAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2385. An act to establish best practices for State, tribal and local governments participating in the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; in addition, to the Committee on Homeland Security 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.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 27, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 2229. To amend title 5, United States Code, to provide permanent authority for judicial review of certain Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 931. To require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 28, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5320. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31195; Amdt. No.: 3801] received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5321. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31196; Amdt. No.: 3802] received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5322. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Greenwood, MS [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0994; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASO-21] received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5323. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Flint, MI, and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Owosso, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0020; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-28] received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5324. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace, Duncan, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0100; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASW-3] received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5325. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Norman, OK; and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Oklahoma City, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0825; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASW-12] received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5326. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0907; Product Identifier 2017-NM-069-AD; Amendment 39-19274; AD 2018-09-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5327. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Direc-

tives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1246; Product Identifier 2017-NM-086-AD; Amendment 39-19297; AD 2018-11-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5328. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1175; Product Identifier 2017-NM-087-AD; Amendment 39-19300; AD 2018-11-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5329. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0413; Product Identifier 2018-NM-061-AD; Amendment 39-19283; AD 2018-10-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5330. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0776; Product Identifier 2017-NM-062-AD; Amendment 39-19264; AD 2018-09-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5331. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0779; Product Identifier 2017-NM-040-AD; Amendment 39-19301; AD 2018-11-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5332. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1421; Product Identifier 2014-NM-177-AD; Amendment 39-19302; AD 2018-11-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5333. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1099; Product Identifier 2017-NM-093-AD; Amendment 39-19296; AD 2018-11-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5334. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0117; Product Identifier 2017-NM-104-AD; Amendment 39-19298; AD 2018-11-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5335. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1245; Product Identifier 2017-NM-099-AD; Amendment 39-19266; AD 2018-09-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5336. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0071; Product Identifier 2017-NM-063-AD; Amendment 39-19280; AD 2018-10-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5337. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1245; Product Identifier 2017-NM-099-AD; Amendment 39-19266; AD 2018-09-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5338. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0492; Product Identifier 2018-NM-083-AD; Amendment 39-19303; AD 2018-11-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5339. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0490; Product Identifier 2018-NM-018-AD; Amendment 39-19299; AD 2018-11-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5340. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International S.A. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0443; Product Identifier 2018-NE-14-AD; Amendment 39-19286; AD 2018-10-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5341. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aircraft Industries a.s. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0462; Product Identifier 2018-CE-017-AD; Amendment 39-19292; AD 2018-11-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5342. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1063; Product Identifier 2017-SW-088-AD;

Amendment 39-19291; AD 2018-11-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5343. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3883; Product Identifier 2014-SW-029-AD; Amendment 39-19289; AD 2018-11-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5344. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0874; Product Identifier 2015-SW-082-AD; Amendment 39-19282; AD 2018-10-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5345. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0667; Product Identifier 2016-SW-053-AD; Amendment 39-19281; AD 2018-10-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5346. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1163; Product Identifier 2017-CE-041-AD; Amendment 39-19260; AD 2018-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5347. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Safran Helicopter Engines, S.A., Turboshift Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0838; Product Identifier 2017-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-19275; AD 2018-10-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5348. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Safran Helicopter Engines, S.A., Turboshift Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0838; Product Identifier 2017-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-19275; AD 2018-10-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5349. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0373; Product Identifier 2018-CE-009-AD; Amendment 39-19278; AD 2018-10-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5350. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0372; Product Identifier 2018-CE-011-AD; Amendment 39-19279; AD 2018-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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 Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 5905. A bill to authorize basic research programs in the Department of Energy Office of Science for fiscal years 2018 and 2019; with an amendment (Rept. 115-787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 5907. A bill to provide directors of the National Laboratories signature authority for certain agreements, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-788). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 5346. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for licenses and experimental permits for space support vehicles, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-789). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCaul: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5729. A bill to restrict the department in which the Coast Guard is operating from implementing any rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards until after submission to Congress of the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program; with an amendment (Rept. 115-790, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 971. Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 970) insisting that the Department of Justice fully comply with the requests, including subpoenas, of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subpoena issued by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to potential violations of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act by personnel of the Department of Justice and related matters (Rept. 115-791). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. BASS (for herself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DANNY K.

DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SIREs, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 6236. A bill to require the reunification of families separated upon entry into the United States as a result of the "zero-tolerance" immigration policy requiring criminal prosecution of all adults apprehended crossing the border illegally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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. NUNES:

H.R. 6237. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr.

GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DeFAZIO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BEYER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 6238. A bill to secure the rights of public employees to organize, act concertedly, and bargain collectively, which safeguard the public interest and promote the free and unobstructed flow of commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr.

BEYER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DeFAZIO, Ms. DeGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DeSAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Ms.

NORTON, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. NEAL, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HECK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. BERA, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BASS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAMB, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LOEBSSACK, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 6239. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Financial Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, 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. COLLINS of New York (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 6240. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for certain user fees under the 340B drug discount program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 6241. A bill to prohibit certain business concerns from receiving assistance from the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. COOK (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 6242. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to clarify the authority of tribal governments in regard to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 6243. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to eliminate the repatriation loan program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 6244. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 300 South Fourth Street in Minneapolis, Minnesota, as the "Diana E. Murphy United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 6245. A bill to require access to Federal facilities by Member of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. BACON, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SABLON, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. TROTT, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 6246. A bill to enable the admission of the territory of Puerto Rico into the Union as a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 6247. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the minimum age at which a widow or widower may remarry and remain eligible for benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 6248. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require radio and television broadcasters to provide free broadcasting time for political advertising, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. JONES, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 6249. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to treat certain foreign-owned corporations and business organizations as foreign nationals for purposes of the ban on campaign activity, to prohibit foreign-affiliated section 501(c)(4) organizations from making contributions to super PACs or disbursing funds for independent expenditures or electioneering communications, to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to reform the procedures for the registration of agents of foreign principals under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. KILMER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. POSEY, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 6250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for lifelong learning accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 6251. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permanently appropriate funding for the administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Rules, and 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 Mr. MCEACHIN (for himself and Mr. FASO):

H.R. 6252. A bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act to provide for additional procedures for families with children under the age of 6, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6253. A bill to prohibit the Department of Health and Human Services from using any Federal funds to conduct or support a video contest on the Internet or by means of other media; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and Natural Resources, 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. PALLONE (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LOEBSSACK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 6254. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations to ensure access to voice service in order to facilitate communications between, and reunification of, alien guardians and alien children, to provide for certain requirements relating to inmate calling services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 6255. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish measures to combat invasive lionfish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 6256. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to allow Members of Congress to tour detention facilities that house foreign national minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.J. Res. 136. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States waiving the application of the first article of amendment to the political speech of corporations and other business organizations with respect to the disbursement of funds in connection with public elections and granting Congress and the States the power to establish limits on contributions and expenditures in elections for public office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BRAT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H. Res. 970. A resolution insisting that the Department of Justice fully comply with the requests, including subpoenas, of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subpoena issued by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to potential violations of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act by personnel of the Department of Justice and related matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. HULTGREN introduced a bill (H.R. 6257) for the relief of Judge Neringa Venckiene, who the Government of Lithuania seeks on charges related to her pursuit of justice against Lithuanian public officials accused of sexually molesting her young niece; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 6236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This resolution is enacted pursuant to the power granted in Congress under Article I, Section 1.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 6237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States government are carried out to support the national security interests of the United States, to support and assist the armed forces of the United States, and to support the President in the execution of the foreign policy of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in pertinent part, that "Congress shall have power . . . to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States"; ". . . to raise and support armies . . ."; "To provide and maintain a Navy"; "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 for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 6238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 6239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 6240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 6241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 6242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 6243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 6244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, 7 & 18; Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 6245.

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 Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 6246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

"New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress."

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution

"The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 6247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have 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.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other power vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 6248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 6249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 4 of Article I

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 6250.

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. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 6251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 6252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 6254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution. That provision gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 6255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 6256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 6257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power “to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States.”

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.J. Res. 136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 50: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 154: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 173: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 184: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 237: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 569: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 592: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 754: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 930: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 959: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 972: Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 1150: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 1204: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 1247: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1318: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1337: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 1409: Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1511: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1606: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1683: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 1734: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 1789: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1874: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2272: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2345: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 2416: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2591: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2598: Mr. CLAY and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2719: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2871: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 2895: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2976: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3309: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 3310: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 3378: Mr. KIHUEN.
H.R. 3593: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 3923: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 4099: Mr. FASO.
H.R. 4704: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4737: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 4843: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4940: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 4969: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 4985: Mr. HURD.
H.R. 5004: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 5011: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 5058: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 5105: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5160: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 5145: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 5160: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 5191: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 5248: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 5270: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 5359: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 5385: Mr. UPTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 5460: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 5521: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DAVIDSON, and Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 5574: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 5576: Mr. CURTIS.
H.R. 5595: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 5634: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5648: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 5671: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 5814: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 5819: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 5855: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 5898: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 5905: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 5906: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 5907: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 5922: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 5948: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 5949: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MARINO, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 5988: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 6012: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 6014: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. REED, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 6048: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BARRAGAN, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 6062: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 6075: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 6103: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 6114: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 6121: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 6174: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 6178: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 6180: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. VELA, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CORREA, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 6190: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 6193: Mr. COHEN, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 6197: Ms. TITUS and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 6207: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 6222: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6223: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6225: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.J. Res. 33: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. COSTA.
H.J. Res. 48: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.J. Res. 53: Mr. LANCE.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. COFFMAN.
H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. CORREA.
H. Res. 318: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H. Res. 673: Mr. COOK and Mr. SESSIONS.
H. Res. 914: Mr. EMMER.
H. Res. 927: Mr. O’ROURKE.
H. Res. 944: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. COOK, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H. Res. 960: Mr. TAKANO.
H. Res. 962: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. YOHO.

DELETIONS 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. 2069: Mr. KHANNA.